



**TO:** Policy Board

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

**SUBJECT:** Ratify Modified 2010 Work Plan and Budget

**DATE:** July 20, 2010 – **Addendum to June 18<sup>th</sup> Report**  
(For Jul 21<sup>st</sup> meeting)

**REQUEST:**

That the Policy Board repurpose \$57,000 in 2010 MetroGIS project funding for five projects, including a Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Stand Pilot that was not included in the initial agenda report, dated June 18.

The possibility of the change to fund the stormwater standard pilot was cited in a note at the bottom of the first page of the June 18<sup>th</sup> report. To do so, the Phase II Performance Metrics project is proposed to 2011. This postponement is not of major consequence since the project would not be able to begin prior to mid to late fall 2010.

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION – PROPOSED STORMWATER STANDARD PILOT**

The June 18 recommendation to fund Projects a-d, below, is unchanged. On July 16, the Committee completed an E-Vote to recommend that the Policy Board authorize 2010 funding for the subject Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard pilot in place the previously recommended Performance Metrics Project. The vote was: 21-yes, 0-no, 1-abstain, and 3 - did not vote.

All three city representatives and the watershed district representative to the Committee voted in favor, though several questions were raised in the process of the e-vote by members of the Coordinating Committee. Their questions and along with the project team’s responses are presented in the Reference Section under Item “e”.

This input will be useful as the project team develops the specific project plan in negotiation with the contract recipient

**REVISED PROPOSAL- FINAL RECOMMENDED 2010 PROJECTS**

- |                                                                   |                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| a) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Generation Shared Information Needs Assessment | \$15,000            |
| b) Refresh/add Web 2.0 Functionality to MetroGIS website          | \$17,000            |
| c) Consolidated Clip, Zip, and Ship Tool                          | \$5,000             |
| d) Geocoder Service Enhancements                                  | \$10,000            |
| <del>e) Revised Performance Metrics project</del>                 | <del>\$10,000</del> |
| <u>e) Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard Pilot</u>         | <u>\$10,000</u>     |

*(A synopsis of each of these projects is attached. These synopses are the same as those provide in the June 18<sup>th</sup> report with the exception of the new description or the stormwater.)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Policy Board approve revisions to 2010 MetroGIS Work Plan and \$57,000 “foster collaboration” budget as presented in the report (Attachments A and B, respectively), subject to the addressing the comments offered herein regarding the Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard Pilot .

# REFERENCE SECTION

## SYNOPSIS

### PROPOSED/REVISED 2010

### METROGIS-FUNDED PROJECTS

#### a) **Project Name:**

##### **Second - Generation Shared Information Needs Analysis - Phase I (*Activity A1*)**

###### Amount requested

\$15,000 Estimated. Actual cost dependent upon results of RFP

###### Summary

Conduct an assessment to identify geospatial needs (e.g., data, services and applications) shared by the cross-sector, stakeholders that comprise the MetroGIS community and conduct an exercise to define the highest priorities. The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator would serve as the project manager. A workgroup would oversee development of the RFP and conduct of the assessment. Phase 1 2010 – Retain contractor and work on process design.

###### How funding would be used

Funding would be used to retain a consultant to work under the general direction of MetroGIS workgroup.

###### Benefit to MetroGIS community

Ensure that MetroGIS's efforts to foster collaborative solutions to shared needs are relevant to changing stakeholder needs.

---

#### b) **Project Name:**

##### **Refresh and Expand Collaborative Functionality of MetroGIS Website (*Activity B1*)**

*Phase I – Needs Assessment and Design Specifications*

###### Amount requested

\$17,000 Estimated. Actual cost dependent upon results of RFP

###### Summary

The design of the metrogis.org website was last modified in 2001. Redesign is needed to update the site's look and feel, improve functionality, restructure current content organization, expand its purpose to meet more user needs, and simplify content management. One goal of this organization is to incorporate Web 2.0 functionality so that MetroGIS partners can easily participate in shared project work tasks, discuss ideas, opinions and preferences without the need to physically attend a meeting. Another is to improve the manner in which the institutional memory is organized to expedite locating information about the range of MetroGIS activities, successes and initiatives. Tanya Mayer, with the Council GIS Unit, would serve as the technical project manager.

###### How funding would be used

Funding would be used to retain a consultant to work under the general direction of MetroGIS workgroup.

###### Benefit to MetroGIS community

If a clear understanding of shared geospatial needs must exist in order to ensure that MetroGIS is able to pursue timely collaborative solutions that are relevant to changing stakeholder needs.

#### c) **Project Name:**

##### **Zip, Clip & Ship Functionality for Minnesota Geospatial Commons (*Activity A2a*)**

###### Amount requested

\$5,000

Summary

Hire programming consultant to develop a tool for agencies to make available zip, clip & ship functionality of datasets via their services within the Minnesota Geospatial Commons. Jessica Deegan, with the Council’s GIS Unit, would serve as project manager.

**How funding would be used**

Funding would be used to hire programming assistance in two distinct pieces.

- 1) Develop a template geoprocessing model for agencies to implement zip, clip & ship functionality from their data services.
- 2) Develop functionality to consolidate requests for the end user from federated data storage/service delivery points.

The funding request estimates 50 hours for a senior level programmer at \$100 per hour. *Estimate based on current going rate for \$95/hour consulting fees for a senior programmer at MnGeo.*

Benefit to MetroGIS community

Having a zip, clip & ship mechanism in the Commons would restore functionality for an end user acquiring clipped data downloads. This functionality was initially a part of DataFinder Café but is presently not supported. In addition, MetroGIS data and services customers would have consolidated access to clipped data from variety of other data sources, such as Mn DNR and MnGeo.

**d) Project Name:**

**Metro Geocoder Service Enhancements (*MetroGIS Framework Service*) (*Activity A2b*)**

Amount requested

\$10,000

Summary

Hire programming consultant to accomplish the “Geocoder Extensions” listed below. Nancy Read, with Metropolitan Mosquito Control District, would serve as project manager. A RFP process may be needed for the parser functionality component.

**Geocoder Extensions – Funding Request, 2010**

The Metro Geocoder is one of the first examples of a MetroGIS project that delivers a working web service that involves processing on endorsed data sets, not just delivering data. It can be used as a basic part of fulfilling other potential web service projects, such as the Proximity Finder / Jurisdiction Finder. It can use the new Addressable Units data set as a data source, and could be used in conjunction with the Address Edit tool. It could easily be expanded to provide a statewide geocoding solution. It demonstrates the use of open source code for solution development.

There are a few things about the current Geocoder implementation that users have requested be revised to expand use:

1. Add a “universal search” parser front-end so user could send service a text string and it figures out which parts are street (or intersection or landmark), city, state, zip. Currently the end-user application has to be set up to enter parts separately. Example:

Mailing Address 1	<input type="text" value="11646 5th St Ne"/>
Mailing Address 2	<input type="text"/>
Mailing City	<input type="text"/> ▼
Location City	<input type="text" value="Blaine"/> ▼
Mailing State	<input type="text" value="Minnesota"/> ▼
Mailing Zip	<input type="text" value="55434"/>

Users would like to be able to enter this in one string, similar to major online public geocoders.

2. Add return of a “standardized” address, possibly USPS

3. Add an easy batch interface – the State geocoder group now getting started (Mike Dolbow, Kent Treichel, Tim Zimmerman, John Wiersma) is particularly interested in a batch interface, but other metro users have also used the existing geocoder that way
4. More code/instructions/examples for using geocoder with ESRI products
5. The current PAGC geocoder code requires the underlying data to be delivered in shapefile format, which it then converts to Berkeley DB for internal use. Some in the PAGC development community would like to convert how PAGC runs so that it can use data directly from sources such as Navteq or anything in SQLite. This would make it easier for us locally to package our current web service for setting up redundant sites, or to set up automatic updates of underlying data. The full proposal from the programmer to the PAGC development community is available at [http://www.deadwrite.com/pagc\\_restructure.pdf](http://www.deadwrite.com/pagc_restructure.pdf)

The original Geocoder group includes Jim Maxwell (TLG), Dave Bitner (MAC), Kent Treichel (MN Dept. of Revenue), Pete Olsen, Chris Cialek, and Jim Dickerson (LMIC), Bob Basques (City of St. Paul), Gordy Chinander (Metro Emergency Services Board), Mark Kotz (Metro Council), and Nancy Read (MMCD, project manager and contact for correspondence, nancread@mmcd.org, 651-643-8386). Additional participants for Landmarks: Matt McGuire (Metro Council), Ron Wencil (USGS). We plan to coordinate with the State Geocoder group (listed above) as well.

#### How funding would be used

Funding would be used to hire programming assistance

#### Benefit to MetroGIS community

A more responsive geocoding service that can be called up to support numerous stakeholder applications.

#### ~~e) Project Name: (Dropped July 20, 2010)~~

##### ~~**Develop Performance Measurement Methods/Metrics – Phase I (Activity B1)**~~

~~*Phase I – Make as much progress as possible in 2010 (S)*~~

#### ~~Amount requested~~

~~\$10,000 Estimated in 2010. Actual cost dependent upon results of RFP~~

#### ~~Summary~~

~~In October 2009, the Policy Board adopted an updated Performance Measurement Plan. This plan provides guidance for development of actual metrics to measure progress toward accomplishing outcomes defined for MetroGIS's efforts. The results of the in-progress MetroGIS Quantify Public Value (QPV) study are expected to provide insight and information valuable to the development of metrics, hence, work on metrics development has been postponed until sufficient progress is made on the QPV study. The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator would serve as the project manager. A workgroup would oversee development of the RFP to retain consultant assistance and oversee conduct of the project.~~

#### ~~How funding would be used~~

~~Funding would be used to retain a consultant to work under the general direction of MetroGIS workgroup.~~

#### ~~Benefit to MetroGIS community~~

~~One cannot manage what one cannot measure. MetroGIS cannot achieve its stated mission (enhance stakeholder operating capacity) unless its efforts are able to remain relevant to changing stakeholder needs. MetroGIS leadership cannot be sure that MetroGIS's efforts are relevant without a means to progress/impact. The purpose of this project is to provide these means.~~

#### **e) Project Name (Added July 20, 2010)**

##### **Stormwater Data Exchange Standard Pilot (Activity A2c)**

#### Amount requested

\$10,000

#### Summary

The pilot is proposed to confirm that the producers of the subject data – generally cities and watershed districts – are able to contribute the data via the standard format, evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the standard itself, and create a means to visually demonstrate application of the standard. (See Attachment C for more information and the standard itself.)

### How funding would be used

Funding would be used to hire a consultant to conduct the pilot.

### Benefit to MetroGIS community

Act on the stormwater component of the broad hydrology-related shared priority information need defined in the first round needs assessment conducted in 1996-97.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Detailed Project Description:**

#### **Stormwater Data Exchange Standard – Proposed Pilot Project**

7/7/10 (N. Read) rev. 7/20/10

#### Background:

Hydrology is one of the major information needs identified by MetroGIS participants, and is an area with many challenges typical of metro datasets. Data on lakes, ponds, wetlands, creeks and rivers have been created by many units of government at many scales for various uses. In the Metro area, much of the hydrology is in stormwater systems. It is difficult to analyze water flow without knowledge of this underground network of pipes, outfalls, and treatment devices, and connections to and through receiving waters (Kloiber and Hinz 2008 NHD study,

<http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/environment/NHUpdateTCMA.pdf>).

Spatial data on stormwater systems have many potential uses, such as aiding in emergency response (see MetroGIS 2008 workshop results), water quality management, flood preparedness, and vector control. Most uses of this data depend on being able to combine information from a variety of originating sources, primarily city governments, plus county and regional governments, watershed districts, and MnDOT.

A group of representatives from local, regional and state government and private sector engineering firms has been working since 2008 on developing a Data Exchange Standard for stormwater structures (Appendix). This Standard has gone through MnGeo Standards Committee and will be released for general use soon.

#### Pilot Project:

Both the standards group and attendees at a July 2009 meeting of stormwater data stakeholders recommended a pilot project be done to find and address possible issues with the standard, and improve chances of widespread use. The project would involve several units of government, such as a two or more cities plus a watershed district, county, and engineering firm involved in aggregating the data. Project tasks include:

1. Select an area that includes some portion of two or more adjacent cities. The cities should represent different base systems for handling data, including GIS and CAD.
2. Migrate existing data into the Digital Exchange Standard format.
3. Prepare a summary documenting the procedures used in migrating the data, including the amount of time required for various tasks and any other costs that might be incurred.
4. Once the data from all sources are in the proper format, develop a unified GIS layer for the study area, and assess its usability.
5. Prepare a document outlining the process of migration of data into the standard format, assess costs and benefits, and include recommended changes to the standard and procedures or tools that data producers can use to migrate data into the standard.

The result would provide:

1. an analysis of what it takes to get information into the standard
2. an analysis of the standard itself – strengths and deficiencies
3. a shapefile that has utility for a number of different users and can be used to visually demonstrate application of the standard.

#### Funding administration:

- An amount of approximately \$10,000 is available for this project.

- If the entity directly receiving funding from the Metropolitan Council is not a unit of government, a competitive process and evaluation must be used.
- All funds must be invoiced and work completed by December 31, 2010.

**A. Participants in development of the Exchange Standard for Digital Stormwater System Data:**

Molly Churchich – Ramsey County  
 Brad Digre – Short Elliott Hendrickson Inc.  
 Adam Freihoefer – Metropolitan Council  
 Hart Gilchrist – Bonestroo  
 Steve Kloiber – Minnesota Department of Natural Resources  
 Paul Leegard – Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
 Joe Lewis – Houston Engineering  
 Barb Loida – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 Carrie Mack – Ramsey-Washington Watershed District  
 John Mackiewicz – WSB and Associates  
 Susanne Maeder – Minnesota Geospatial Information Office  
 Thomas Martin – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 Jason Menard – United States Geological Survey  
 Beth Neuendorf – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 Mark Olsen – Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
 Jane Onorati – Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
 Bonnie Peterson – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 Nancy Read – Metropolitan Mosquito Control District  
 Lisa Saylor – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 John Studtmann – City of Minneapolis  
 Kellie Thom – Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 Mike Trojan – Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Participants in initial Stakeholder Review meeting:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Mark Schulz	Bolton and Menck
Bobby Crane	Mendota Heights
Molly Churchich	Ramsey County
Janet Dalglish	U of M
Madeline Magee	U of M
Daniel Sward	U of M
Mike Kasel	Rosemount
John Mackiewicz	WSB
Eric Prieve	Lakeville
Scott Anderson	Bloomington
Adam Kordiak	Faribault
Patrick Mylan	Inver Grove Heights
Pat Byrne	Minneapolis
Kathy Nielson	Spring Lake

\*\*\*\*\*

**Questions/Comments received during E-vote and responses to them**  
**RE: Stormwater Data Exchange Standard Pilot:**

***1. How does this project relate to the proposed Duluth stormwater mapping pilot project? (J. Givens, MnDOT)***

The pilot project referred to in this question was proposed by the USGS and Mike Trojan of MPCA, who is also the facilitator for the Stormwater Standards workgroup. The project was to collect all stormwater data for the Duluth area (CAD, GIS, paper, whatever) and create a GIS data set with full connectivity suitable for inclusion in the high-resolution National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), as well as a report detailing techniques and methods. This is similar to the USGS-funded project done by Steve Kloiber at the Metropolitan Council (2008) that was the impetus for first assembling the Stormwater Standards workgroup. The Duluth project requested \$480,000 from EPA, but was not awarded funding at this time.

The project we are proposing for MetroGIS funding is much more limited, and includes only what was step 1 and 2 of 4 in the Duluth-area proposal, the collection of datasets and conversion to GIS format, with assessment of their usability for attributes and connectivity. We are not proposing building and QA of an NHD-standard data set, and given the limited funds, may take a sample of data from several sources rather than trying to cover an entire area. The Metro project proposed would also focus more on the usability of the standard by cities and other data sources. The completion of the proposed project would provide valuable input for the Duluth-area NHD project, if and when it is funded, as well as other future projects. The proposed Metro project, with its focus on working with cities, could also be helpful to establishing the importance and defining the issues of using this local data source in nationally-integrated data sets.

***2. Has an inventory of collection methods and standards been conducted so a representative sample can be selected for the pilot project? (R. Gelbman, Metro Council)***

A survey was one of the first things the Stormwater group did, back in Aug. of 2008. Of 235 “MS4s” (regulated units) surveyed, we received 120 responses, 61 of which were from cities, the rest from other regulated entities, counties, townships, and watershed districts. Of the systems used to store data, 43% reported using AutoCADD, 39% used Shapefiles, and 29% used a GeoDatabase (a respondent could have more than one) (Brief survey results are Appendix A in the “supporting” document to the standard, sent in the package). This was why we particularly wanted to choose an area with both CAD and GIS (probably ESRI) users. What we do want to find out more about through the pilot project is more details about how these entities are storing their data – layers, attributes, drawing techniques (this is a big one for pipe flow direction), symbolization, use of CAD annotation – the kinds of things that make it difficult to pull the data together, and then look at possible tools could be shared or other recommendations for dealing with these issues.

***3. Seems like not many Cities were represented in the standards development process to date? (Brad Henry, URS); Let’s make sure the pilot project touches a sample of all entities along the system. (Ben Verbick, LOGIS);***

The Stormwater Standard workgroup has been concerned about getting more city input, which is a main reason for this project. Although there was little direct city input on the workgroup (see p.30 in support doc.), some of the engineering firm people represented cities, about half of our survey respondents were from cities, and when we sent the draft standard out for review most of the comments were from cities. In July 2009 we held an open meeting to get more input, and representatives attended from Mendota Heights, Rosemount, Lakeville, Bloomington, Faribault, Minneapolis, and Spring Lake, and Inver Grove Heights, as well as more engineering firm reps. These city attendees were the ones who suggested doing a pilot project, and some volunteered to be part of it.

Like any exchange standards project, part of the challenge has been that the larger-area organizations see the need and receive more (apparent) benefits from having a standard than do the individual data producers, and were more willing to put time into developing the standard. However, we all know that the standard must be workable for cities to have it actually be used. This pilot project is intended to test that and develop tools or make changes as needed before the workgroup starts a major communication effort with municipalities.

***4. We (Bloomington) support the development of a pilot project to analyze the impact and result of implementing this standard. That said it is hoped the project will meaningfully engage many of the issues identified in the public review process and those yet to be identified by the pilot. There would also be value in quantifying the impact from the data providers perspective; not just of the effort***

*to implement the standard but what specific longer term benefits can the providers anticipate. Additionally, analysis of the increase in value/usefulness of the standardized data beyond what currently could be generated is likely outside the scope of this project, but is important to developing a supportable business case for the adoption of the standard.* (Hal Busch, Bloomington).

As stated in the above response (#3), the workgroup recognizes there are concerns about the potential impact and benefits of using this Data Exchange Standard. Again, that is one of the main reasons for conducting the pilot study, and specifically involving cities in such a way that effort can be quantified and benefits identified. More wording to this effect has been added to the project plan in response to this comment.

The proposed Standard is entirely voluntary for local government use, like other statewide GIS standards. Some participants have been concerned about this because of MPCA's involvement. MPCA has been interested in the standard because current regulation of "Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems" (MS4's) already requires permittees to submit a map of systems in urbanized areas as part of the NPDES permit process every 5 years. MPCA does not require this map to be in any particular format. Both MPCA and many regulated entities would like to make these existing mapping efforts more useful for all those involved, if it can be done without creating more burden on those providing the data. As Hal states above, evaluating the increase in value from standardized data to all participants will be important.

## ATTACHMENT A

### Revised MetroGIS 2010 Program Objectives (Recommended July 19, 2010)

*(Objectives proceeded with "\*\*\*" cannot be fully achieved without these additional resources).*

Program Objective (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	Priority	Status - Comments	<u>Estimated Non-Staff MetroGIS Expense</u>	Lead Responsibility
1. Sustain traditional "foster collaboration" support activities <sup>(a)</sup> .	<b>Very High</b>	<u>Ongoing</u> . Directive in the 2008-2011 Business Plan established this item as the top annual priority. Key to maintaining relevance to changing stakeholder needs.	N/A	Designated Custodians and Staff Coordinator
<del>32</del> . Execute a Next-Generation Street Centerline Data Access Agreement	<b>Very High</b>	<u>In process</u> . The current agreement will expire 12/31/10. A RFP was published on July 2. Deadline for proposal is July 30.	N/A	Staff Coordinator
<del>123</del> . ** Pursue implementation of a more fully developed geographic data, applications and service broker, <u>including "explore methods for Enhancing Trust in reliability of shared services", as it is a requirement to achieve the former" (formerly Item 13).</u>	<b>Very High</b>	<u>In process</u> . A component of catalyzing cross-sector partnerships– a top priority of the Policy Board leadership. Collaborating with MnGeo via joint workgroup. Geospatial Commons Test implementation in progress.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Retain a programming consultant to create a clip, zip and ship function valuable to DataFinder</u></li> </ul>	\$5,000	Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair
<del>13</del> —** Explore methods for Enhancing Trust in reliability of shared services.— (combined with old #12, new #3)	<b>High</b>	<del>2009 objective postponed to 2010 per Policy Board decision on July 22, 2009. A requirement to accomplish Item 12-</del>		<del>Technical Leadership Workgroup—Mark Kotz, Chair</del>
4. **Implement a Regional Address Points Dataset and Web-Editing Application to assist smaller producers of address data participate in the regional solution.	<b>Very High</b>	<u>In process</u> . Application development anticipated to begin late spring 2010 via contract with Applied Geographics.  Phase I contributions to actual regional dataset began spring 2010. Technical assistance/outreach plan to assist producers contribute data to be devised for 2011 implementation	1) <i>Prior funding</i>  2) <del>\$10,000</del> <u>(premature for 2010)</u>	Address Workgroup - Mark Kotz/Nancy Read Co-project managers.
<u>5. Develop Quantify Public Value (QPV) methodology (Incorporates 2009 work plan task "Investigate impact of cost recovery on ability to achieve desired data sharing")</u>	<b>Very High</b>	<u>In process</u> . Key component to catalyzing cross-sector partnerships – a top priority of Policy Board leadership. Study launched May 2010 with fed grant. Anticipated completion June 2011. Results expected to provide insight for Items 7, 10 and 11.	N/A	Staff Coordinator, <u>Francis Harvey, and W4Sight, LLC</u>

<b>Program Objective</b> (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Status - Comments</b>	<u><b>Estimated Non-Staff MetroGIS Expense</b></u>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>
<p><b>56.</b> <b>**</b>Implementation solutions to shared technical geospatial (web service / applications) needs:</p> <p>a) Best Image Service (2009 funded project)</p> <p>b) Government Service Finder Prototype (2009 funded project)</p> <p><del>c) Host a Web Feature Services contest modeled after the Apps for Democracy contest hosted by Washington D.C. Part of 5e.</del></p> <p><del>d) **Populate metadata for GeoServices Finder, including creation of a template to promote standardization (Potential future component of the MN Geospatial Commons project - Item 3.)</del></p> <p>c) (See #3 - consolidated clip, zip and ship functionality)</p> <p>d) Geocoder Service Enhancements (MetroGIS Framework Service)</p> <p>e) Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard Pilot</p>	<p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p> <p><b>Very High</b></p>	<p><u>Ongoing.</u> Pursuit of Regional GIS Projects is a key means to address research and development needs as well as demonstrate value to policy makers This generic objective is called out as a separate. In so doing, each of these projects plays a key role to accomplishing objectives vital accomplishing long-term sustainability.</p> <p><u>Component of Geospatial Portal</u></p> <p><u>Enhances previous investment by MetroGIS</u></p> <p><u>Acts on a shared priority need defined in the initial priority setting in 1996-97.</u></p>	<p>Prior year funding</p> <p>Prior year funding</p> <p>\$18,500</p> <p>\$3,500</p> <p><u>(see Item 3)</u></p> <p>\$10,000</p> <p>\$10,000</p>	<p>Project workgroups that proposed the projects with advice from the Technical Leadership Workgroup - Mark Kotz, Chair.</p>
<p><b>87.</b> <b>**</b>Conduct second-generation shared information needs assessment. <u>(Phase I: Retain contractor and initiate work on research design. Complete in 2011)</u></p> <p><u>(Results of Quantify Public Value (QPV) study (#5) expected offer some insight.)</u></p>	<p><b>Very High</b></p>	<p><u>Not started.</u> Key component to catalyzing cross-sector partnerships. Identified in Business Plan to be conducted in conjunction with shared application needs assessment.</p> <p>In November 2008, a forum was hosted to identify shared application and service needs. Actionable results for several shared service needs but on progress on shared application opportunities.</p> <p>Complimenting this activity: Performance Measurement Plan calls for actions to understand and act on emerging needs and continually assess user satisfaction via surveys and peer review forums.</p>	<p><u>\$15,000</u></p> <p><u>(Phase I)</u></p>	<p>Staff Coordinator with advice from <u>consultant and TLW</u></p>
<p><b>8.</b> Refresh and expand functionality of MetroGIS's organizational website (metrogis.org) to better support collaboration. (e.g., improve ease of access, support on-line collaborative document editing, add survey tools.) <u>(Phase I -Needs Assessment and Design Requirements)</u></p>	<p><b>Very High</b></p>	<p><u>Defined as a need during the 2008-2011 Business Planning process. No substantive changes have been made to the architecture since 2001.</u></p>	<p>\$17,000</p>	<p>Staff Coordinator and Council GIS Unit support TBD</p>

<b>Program Objective</b> (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Status - Comments</b>	<u>Estimated Non-Staff MetroGIS Expense</u>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>
<b>419.</b> Investigate organizational/governance structure changes necessary to effectively address priority shared geospatial needs	<b>Very High</b>	<u>In process.</u> Related to exploring partnering opportunities with non-government interests. Also a high priority of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC). MetroGIS's experience and needs were integrated into a <a href="#">white paper</a> developed by the NGAC Governance Subcommittee and endorsed by the full NGAC on 12/2/09 and subsequently set as a 2010-2011 NGAC work priority	<u>N/A</u>	Staff Coordinator
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$57,000</b>	
<b><i>STRETCH OBJECTIVES TIME AND RESOURCES PERMITTING</i></b>				
<b>710.</b> Develop specific performance measure methods (measures of public value) to implement 2009 Performance Measurement Plan. <u>Phase II Spring – Develop RFP, assuming sufficient progress on QPV study (Item 5)</u>  <u>(Component of 2010 Quantify Public Value (QPV) study (#5).</u>	<b>Very High</b>	<u>On hold for QPV Study:</u> Second phase of the Performance Measurement Plan update process accomplished in 2009. The Updated Plan calls for annual assessments of stakeholder satisfaction with MetroGIS's efforts via surveys.  Coordinate performance measurement survey design with development of research method for 2 <sup>nd</sup> generation shared information needs evaluation (Item 8)	<del>\$15,000</del> <u>10,000</u>  <u>(Phase II)</u>	Staff Coordinator <u>with supplemental professional services</u>
<b>611.</b> Expand effort related to “fostering awareness of MetroGIS's accomplishments and the public value created via its efforts”, specifically to broaden basic understanding among non-traditional stakeholders and deepen understanding of leadership for key stakeholder interests.  <u>(Component of Quantify Public Value (QPV) study (#5).</u>	<b>Very High</b>	<u>On hold for QPV Study.</u> Coordinate with surveys proposed for the next-generation Performance Measures (Item 11).  Design to address the intent of the action “Evaluate stakeholder participation relative to needs to achieve current regional objectives” called for in Item “f”, Section VIII of the Business Plan”	<u>N/A</u>  <u>(Coordinate with Item 10)</u>	Staff Coordinator with supplemental professional services to assist with defining the methods and materials.

<b>Program Objective</b> (Numbers intended to designate relative importance)	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Status - Comments</b>	<u>Estimated Non-Staff MetroGIS Expense</u>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>
<p>212. Continue to seek addition of dedicated Technical Coordinator and technical administrative resources to the MetroGIS support team.</p> <p><u>(On Hold for Results of Quantify Public Value (QPV) study (#5) might offer some insight.)</u></p>	<b>Very High</b>	<p><u>In process</u> Key to maintaining relevance to changing stakeholder needs</p> <p>A. Continue to investigate options to secure this resource via contributions from multiple interests, once the results of the 2010 QPV study (Item #3) are available.</p> <p>B. In the absence of dedicated technical coordination resources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To the extent possible, the Technical Leadership Workgroup will continue to serve as a surrogate technical coordinator.</li> <li>2) When possible, retain the services of a project/technical coordinator on a project-by-project basis.</li> </ol>	N/A	Staff Coordinator with advice from Technical Leadership Workgroup – Mark Kotz, Chair

<sup>(1)</sup> 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, including applications as well as a data (2009 addition)
- 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**

**2010 MetroGIS Budget Refinements**  
*(June 2010)*

*(See Following Page)*

**2010**  
**MetroGIS "Foster Collaboration" Function Budget**  
(Funding provided by the Metropolitan Council)

		2010	2010
Main Activity	Sub-Activity	Approved (1/27/2010)	Recommended Revisions (6/2010)
<b>Professional Services/Special Projects</b>		<b>\$55,500</b>	<b>\$57,000</b>
	<b>A. Identify and Implement Solutions to Specific Shared Information and Application Needs</b>		
	<del>(1) Host Web Feature Services Contest (assumes other partners)</del>	<del>\$15,000</del>	
	<del>(2) Populate Metadata for Geoservices Finder (in conjunction with A1, above)</del>	<del>\$3,500</del>	
	<del>(3) Technical Assistance/Outreach to Populate Regional Address Points Dataset (Postpone to 2011)</del>	<del>\$10,000</del>	
	(1) Conduct Second -Generation Shared Information Needs Analysis / Ensure Stakeholder Needs are Understood ( <i>Phase I</i> )	Part of B(1) old	\$15,000
	(2) Regional GIS Projects:		
	(a) Consolidated clip, zip and ship tool Geospatial Commons/ DataFinder		\$5,000
	(b) Geocoder Enhancements		\$10,000
	(c) Stormwater Digital Data Exchange Standard Pilot		\$10,000
	<b>B. Organizational Development and Communication Projects</b>		
	<del>(1) Develop Performance Measurement Methods to Implement New Plan Adopted 2009 (Phase I - Design)</del>	<del>\$15,000</del>	<del>\$10,000</del>
	(2) Refresh and Expand collaborative functionality of MetroGIS web site ( <i>Phase I - Design</i> )		\$17,000
	<del>(2) Develop a Plan to Address Known Risks and Obstacles to Sharing (e.g., Security, Licensing, Budgets, etc.)<sup>(iii)</sup></del>	<del>\$7,000</del>	\$0
	<del>(3) Develop new Communications/Outreach Plan</del>	<del>\$3,000</del>	\$0
	<del>(4) Design New Outreach Materials<sup>(i)</sup></del>	<del>\$2,000</del>	\$0
	<del>(5) Leadership Development Plan (based upon 10 key elements defined in 2008)</del>	(iv)	(iv)
	<b>C. Technical Coordinator Outsource Contract (assumes other partners 3+/- year pilot)</b>	<b>TBD<sup>(v)</sup></b>	\$0
<b>Data Access/Sharing Agreements</b>	<b>Regional Parcel Data Sharing Agreement (contract payments to counties per 2009-2011 agreement)</b>	<b>\$28,000</b>	<b>\$28,000</b>
<b>Outreach</b>		<b>\$2,100</b>	<b>\$600</b>
	<b>Printing Outreach Materials (e.g., Information Brochure) Item B(4) must precede.<sup>(vi)</sup></b>	<b>\$500</b>	\$0
	<b>Advocacy/Networking Mileage (200 m/mo x \$.48/mile = \$1,152)<sup>(vii) (viii)</sup></b>	<b>\$1,200</b>	\$500
	<b>Annual Report/Informational Brochure (see above)</b>		
	• Postage – 800 postcards (\$0.30=\$240) in addition to 1500+ via email	\$300	\$50
	• Minimal for other communications	\$100	\$50
<b>Misc Office</b>		<b>\$400</b>	<b>\$400</b>
	<b>Website Domain registration (www.metrogis and www.datafinder - \$32/ea)</b>	<b>\$64</b>	<b>\$64</b>
	<b>Specialty Team/Forum Support Materials</b>	<b>\$336</b>	<b>\$336</b>
	<b>TOTAL NON-STAFF PROJECT FUNDS</b>	<b>\$86,000</b>	<b>\$86,000</b>
<b>NOTES:</b>			
	<sup>(i)</sup> Develop/update of outreach materials to follow Outreach Plan Update project. See Item B(3).		
	<sup>(ii)</sup> This activity includes developing a Livelihood Scheme / Defining Organizational Competencies. See 2008-2011 MetroGIS Business Plan (Chapter 3 - Section VIII and Appendix H) for explanation of organizational competencies and Livelihood Scheme.		
	<sup>(iii)</sup> Request for bids conducted November 2008. No bids received, so project postponed.		
	<sup>(iv)</sup> If sufficient budgeted funds remain uncommitted as of the October Policy Board meeting pursue an out source contract		
	<sup>(v)</sup> TBD. Needs to be preceded by agreement on a organizational structure that permits sharing of ongoing administrative costs and if other sources of funding are determined to be potentially available, decide how much of MetroGIS's funds should be redirected.		
	<sup>(vi)</sup> Rely on limited on-demand printing for handouts. Otherwise distribution of PDFs via Internet		
	<sup>(vii)</sup> Travel by participants is paid by the participant's organization		
	<sup>(viii)</sup> Knowledge sharing opportunities constitute an important reason why individuals elect to participate in MetroGIS activities.		