



Policy Board Members:

Victoria Reinhardt,
Chairperson
Ramsey County

Jim Kordiak,
Vice-Chairperson
Anoka County

Patrice Bataglia,
Dakota County

Gary M. Delaney,
Carver County

Conrad Fiskness,
MAWD

Dennis Hegberg,
Washington County

Antoinette Johns,
TIES

Randy Johnson,
Hennepin County

Gary Schiff,
City of Minneapolis
AMM

Terry Schneider,
City of Minnetonka
AMM

Bob Vogel,
Scott County

Tony Pistilli,
Metropolitan Council

Coordinating Committee

Jane Harper,
Chairperson
Washington County

Dave Drealan,
Vice-Chairperson
Carver County

Staff Coordinator

Randall Johnson,
Metropolitan Council

Wednesday, October 29, 2003

6:30 p.m.

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

Agenda

- | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Call to Order | |
| 2. Accept Agenda | |
| 3. Accept Meeting Summary | |
| a) July 30, 2003 | <i>action</i> 1 |
| 4. GIS Technology Demonstration: | 6 |
| <i>GASB34 and GIS/MetroGIS: What is the connection?</i>
<i>(GASB34 means the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, statement #34)</i> | |
| 5. Major Activity Update | 9 |
| a) Regional Mailing Label Application | |
| b) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access | |
| c) Data Sharing Initiative With Utilities | |
| d) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Coordination with MN GeoIntegrator | |
| e) Priority Common Information Need Solutions | |
| • <i>Emergency Management Workgroup</i> | |
| • <i>Existing Land Use Workgroup</i> | |
| • <i>Lakes and Wetlands Workgroup</i> | |
| • <i>Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Workgroup</i> | |
| • <i>Highway and Road Networks</i> | |
| • <i>Parcels</i> | |
| 6. Action/Discussion Items | |
| a) 2004 Meeting Schedule | <i>action</i> 13 |
| b) Update Frequency Policy Change –
Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Regional Dataset | <i>action</i> 14 |
| c) 2004 Preliminary Budget and Agreement Principles | <i>action</i> 17 |
| d) 2004 Major Program Objectives for MetroGIS | <i>action</i> 25 |
| 7. Information Sharing | 27 |
| a) PolicyLink Recommendations to the Mpls. Foundation – <i>Towards a Regional Strategy for Sustaining Community Focused GIS in Twin Cities Metro</i> | |
| b) New Testimonial – SRF Consulting Group, Inc. | |
| c) Definition Clarification – Planned Land Use Coding for Commuter Rail | |
| d) Presentations / Outreach / Study Activities | |
| e) Related State Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| f) Related Federal/National Geospatial Data Initiatives Update | |
| g) September 17th Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes | |
| 8. Next Meeting | |
| January XX, 2004 | |
| 9. Adjourn | |

Mission Statement

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



TO: MetroGIS Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: July 30, 2003 Meeting Summary

DATE: October 16, 2003
(For the Oct 29th meeting)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board approve the attached meeting summary for its July 30, 2003 meeting.

**Meeting Summary
MetroGIS Policy Board
Room 1A, Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Offices
July 30, 2003**

1. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCE NEW MEMBER

Chairperson Reinhardt called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Terry Schneider (AMM-City of Minnetonka), Patrice Bataglia (Dakota County), Molly O'Rourke for Dennis Hegberg (Washington County), William Brown for Randy Johnson (Hennepin County), Gary Delaney (Carver County), Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County), Bob Vogel (Scott County), Antoinette Johns (TIES), Conrad Fiskness (Metro Watershed Districts), and Tony Pistilli (Metropolitan Council).

Members Absent: Jim Kordiak (Anoka County) and Gary Schiff (AMM-City of Minneapolis)

Coordinating Committee Members Present: David Arbeit, Bill Brown, David Claypool, Will Craig, Dave Drealan (Vice-Chair), Rick Gelbmann, Jane Harper (Chair), Brad Henry, Randy Knippel, Nancy Read, and Ron Wencl.

Support Staff: Randall Johnson, Steve Fester, and Mark Kotz.

Visitors: Jeff Matson (Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System), Dan Falbo (ESRI), Jonette Kraideweis (Mn/DOT), Dan Ross (Mn/DOT), and Chet Harrison (CB Richard Ellis).

Chairperson Reinhardt asked everyone, including the visitors, to introduce themselves.

2. ACCEPT AGENDA

Member Schneider asked for Item 8a to be heard as an action item following agenda item 6c. Member Fiskness moved and Member Delaney seconded to accept the agenda, as modified. Motion carried, ayes all.

3. MEETING SUMMARY

Member Schneider moved and Member Bataglia seconded to approve the summary of the April 30, 2003 meeting as submitted. Motion carried, ayes all.

4. OVERVIEW OF METROGIS – VISION, FUNCTIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND BENEFITS

Staff Coordinator Johnson provided a brief overview of why MetroGIS was created; its vision, functions and accomplishments; and benefits that are being realized by the community as result of the these accomplishments.

Member Schneider encouraged staff to actively seek out ways to inform as many constituent groups as possible of the information provided in this presentation. It was agreed that as a first step the PowerPoint Presentation would be sent to each member of the Policy Board, Coordinating Committee, Technical Advisory Team, and county GIS user groups to share with co-workers and colleagues that may have an interest.

Member Bataglia asked if MetroGIS is aware of PSAPs (E911 Dispatching centers) and the current effort to integrate GIS into their business operations. Johnson noted that MetroGIS is aware of this initiative and at the Metropolitan 911 Board's request is cooperating in their efforts to learn more about GIS technology. Member Bataglia commented that the PSAPs generally feel they have been left behind. Staff asked Member Bataglia to raise this concern later in the meeting when the Board heard an update from the leadership of the Emergency Management Workgroup.

5. GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, introduced Jeff Matson, director of the Minneapolis Neighborhood Information System (MNIS), noting that Public Participation or Community GIS is a national phenomenon but the Twin Cities is a leader in the movement.

Jeff began his presentation by noting that Minneapolis has a number of established and respected neighborhood/community groups that have extensive needs for geospatial data and that parcel level housing related data is at the core. He explained the goals of MNIS are to provide to these groups technical capacity, improve data, improve relationships, and improve networking among the neighborhoods. Mr. Matson noted that a substantive 3-year Department of Commerce grant had been received to help achieve these goals primarily through developing a website to improve access and assisting with the needed data improvements. In addition to the partnership with the Department of Commerce, other partners include the City of Minneapolis, and CURA at the U of M. The complete presentation is available at <http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/ppgis.pdf>. MNIS's website is at <http://www.npcr.org/MNIS>.

6. ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt explained that Policy Board “ratification” is sought for the following three action items. She noted that she had requested this action to ensure that the Policy Board was fully aware of the pending actions, which had been approved by the Coordinating Committee on June 18th. She emphasized that Board approval was not required but that she wanted to avoid any misunderstandings in the future should an issue arise.

a) Highway and Road Network Information Need Solution – Partnership with Mn/DOT

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper summarized a proposed partnership with Mn/DOT as had been endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on June 18 for Policy Board ratification and then introduced Michael Dolbow, project manager, to provide a brief overview of the specifics of the proposed partnership. Dolbow summarized the efforts of a workgroup that made the recommendation to partner with Mn/DOT, noting that the roads and highways standard that Mn/DOT has been developing for three years has merit but needs refinement, and that both partners are looking forward to what the other can bring to the process. He then introduced Jonette Kreideweis with Mn/DOT who commented that the data content standard that Mn/DOT has developed thus far permits crash, traffic, and bridge data produced by many different Mn/DOT units to be used interchangeably. She stated that Mn/DOT is aware that road data produced by local government is often times superior to data produced by others and that use of this standard by all levels will greatly enhance data sharing.

Chairperson Reinhardt thanked Mn/DOT for their willingness to collaborate with MetroGIS and affirmed that this is an incredible opportunity for the MetroGIS community.

Motion: Member Fiskness moved and Member Delaney seconded to ratify the Coordinating Committee’s conclusion that MetroGIS should accept a partnership invitation from Mn/DOT to jointly refine a Highway and Road Networks standard that Mn/DOT developed and ensure related local government needs are adequately addressed by the proposed standard. Motion carried, ayes all.

b) Geospatial Data Theme Categories – Modifications Directed by the Board

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper introduced the two category name changes (elevation and land ownership) that had been made by the Coordinating Committee to the Data Theme Category Standard in response to direction received from the Policy Board when it adopted the categorization scheme at its April 30, 2003 meeting. Board ratification of these changes was requested.

Motion: Member Bataglia moved and Member Vogel seconded to ratify changes made to the Geospatial Data Theme Categories names and definitions by the Coordinating Committee as described herein and as previously directed by the Policy Board. Motion carried, ayes all.

c) Planned Land Use Information Need Solution – Modification of Roles and Responsibilities

Coordinating Committee Chair Harper introduced two modifications made by the Coordinating Committee on June 18th to the Regional Planned Land Use Dataset roles and responsibilities and requested Policy Board ratification. She also summarized the purpose of the Regional Policy Statement which sets forth the agreed upon roles and responsibilities, noting that in prior direction, the Policy Board had authorized the Coordinating Committee to implement changes to Board-approved policy statements if all affected parties agreed, hence the request for Board ratification as opposed to approval.

Chairman Harper introduced Rick Gelbmann, member of the Coordinating Committee and representative of the regional custodian (Metropolitan Council) to explain the proposal accepted by the Coordinating Committee to postpone alignment of the Planned Land Use data with parcel boundary data until substantially less labor-intensive procedures can be implemented. It was noted that this topic will be scheduled for review beginning July 1, 2005, if not investigated earlier in connection with a related common information need. Gelbmann commented that the second change involved adding a category entitled "rail transit way" to the list of coding options.

Staff Coordinator Johnson emphasized that the regional dataset is a generalization of the actual land use plans adopted by the individual communities and that this action would in no way affect those plans. In other words, if a local community does not show rail transit ways in their locally adopted plan it will not show up in the regional dataset. He also clarified that the Planned (or Future) Land Use dataset is different and separate from the proposed Regional Existing Land Use dataset. Finally, Gelbmann clarified that the Metropolitan Council, in its role as regional custodian of the Planned Land Use dataset, will continue to update it on a quarterly basis; only realignment with parcel boundaries has been temporarily postponed.

Motion: Member Delaney moved and Member Fiskness seconded to ratify the Coordinating Committee's decision to modify the regional policy statement for the Planned Land Use priority information need, as explained in the staff report presented at the Policy Board meeting. Motion carried, ayes all.

8a. Cost Savings Measures Implemented

Member Schneider spoke on behalf of receiving the entire agenda electronically because he likes the ability to save and retrieve information at a later date should he want access. Other members who rely upon dialup Internet service noted that electronic access takes a great deal of time to download and that they would prefer to continue to receive the agenda packet via postal mail. Staff noted that multiple distribution formats could be supported and agreed to send a message to each Policy Board member to ask if they would prefer electronic access or continue to receive their agendas via postal mail. If staff does not receive a response, the default will be to continue to mail the paper packet.

7. MAJOR PROJECT UPDATES

a) Regional Mailing Label Application

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, explained that earlier today the workgroup had viewed a prototype regional mailing label application developed by Alison Slaats of the MetroGIS staff which clearly demonstrated such an application is technically feasible. He noted that there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved before the application is deployed, such as reconciling possible impacts on revenues currently received by the counties for similar products. The group expects to offer a recommendation to the Policy Board at its October meeting.

b) Enhancements to MetroGIS DataFinder / Cooperation with MN GeoIntegrator Project

This item was not discussed.

c) Collaborative Parcel Data Distribution Strategy – Non-Government Access

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, noted that a draft common license and a proposed fee schedule were being reviewed by each county. The workgroup is waiting for each of the seven county administrations to respond with comments and/or endorsements.

d) Data Sharing Initiative with Utilities

Dave Drealan, Chair of the County Data Producers Workgroup, summarized an exploratory meeting held on July 10th with representatives of Xcel Energy, CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco, and Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative, noting that both sides (counties and utilities) see merit in further discussions. Next steps will include providing the utilities with a sample of the regional parcel dataset and, if there continues to be interest, setting up a forum for public sector representatives to identify data they may be interested in that are produced by the utilities.

Member Bataglia asked which county interests have been involved. Drealan explained that the initial discussions have been informal with an assumption that at a minimum the counties' right-of-way management and emergency management functions could take advantage of data produced by the

utilities. The plan is to investigate what data may be available and then invite a broad public community to participate in a more formal information discovery process if the decision is to move forward with the collaborative process.

e) Talks with Collar Counties Proposed to Foster Sharing Data

This item was not discussed.

f) Priority Common Information Needs

Chairperson Reinhardt encouraged the Board members to review the report Agenda Item 7 for information about each of the activities currently in progress. She then introduced Coordinating Committee members Knippel and Gelbmann to summarize their work with Emergency Management Workgroup:

Knippel and Gelbmann, co-chairs of MetroGIS's Emergency Management Workgroup summarized the three core initiatives of the workgroup and described how they are coordinating with a parallel MN Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI) workgroup, which they also co-chair. *(Note: see the Agenda Item 7 staff report for the details.)*

Member Schneider commented that the 800-megahertz project possesses substantial resources and that the leaders of that group may be interested in these MetroGIS and GCGI efforts. Knippel commented that he would follow-up as part of their efforts to build relationships and awareness to avoid duplication of effort.

In response to a question from Chairperson Reinhardt, Gelbmann noted that Paul Olson, who presented to the Policy Board about how GIS was used to address the September 11th tragedy in New York City, has accepted an invitation to participate in this effort.

Member Bataglia commented that she is a member of the Metropolitan 911 Board and that the Board is aware of MetroGIS. She concurred that potential exists for further collaboration through facilitating PSAP/911 Board use of the technology. She stressed that they need more than the data, they need to better understand how GIS technology can be put to use to solve their information needs, particularly in times of crisis, and resources available to them to accomplish this end.

Member Delaney encouraged Knippel and Gelbmann to include as a workgroup member someone from the Carver County team that developed the online GIS capabilities currently in use by the Carver County public safety community.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

Chairperson Reinhardt asked the members to review, on their own, the other information sharing items described in the agenda packet.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for October 29, 2003.

10. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Prepared by,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator



TO: MetroGIS Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: GIS Technology Demonstration
GASB 34 and GIS Technology: What is the Connection?

DATE: October 16, 2003
(For the Oct 29th meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Policy Board has asked for a demonstration of GIS technology to be a regular component of each Board meeting. For the Policy Board's October meeting, the Coordinating Committee invited two of its members - Brad Henry with URS/BRW and Bob Cockriel with the City of Bloomington – to explain the importance of GIS technology to accomplishing the requirements of GASB 34 (*Governmental Accounting Standards Board, statement #34*), which apply to local units of government.

An abstract, which provides more background for this presentation, is attached.

PREVIOUS GIS TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION TOPICS

(Refer to the listing on the next page.)

RECOMMENDATION

No action requested.

REFERENCE SECTION

Past Demonstrations

- Jan. 1997: Benefits from GIS in general and uses being made all classes of stakeholders represented on the Policy Board.
- Sep. 1998: DataFinder and Dakota County's Parcel Query Application
- Nov. 1998: Orthoimagery and its Uses
- Apr. 1999: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition GIS Capabilities
- Jul. 1999: Presentation to U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on June 9th
- Apr. 2000: Regional Parcel Dataset (Version 1)
- Jul. 2000: DataFinder and Metropolitan Council's Internet-based Existing Land Use Application
- Oct. 2000: North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition Socio-Demographic Data Initiative
- Jan. 2001: Regional Census Geography and Legislative Redistricting Software/Process
- Apr. 2001: LMIC's MetroViewer (EPPLviewer) using datasets made available via MetroGIS' efforts
- Jul. 2001: MetroGIS capabilities current and proposed for data discovery and acquisition via the Internet
- Oct. 2001: TIES - How school districts have benefited from the presence of MetroGIS.
- Jan. 2002: Paul Olson shared his experience as a GIS professional responding to the World Trade Center tragedy at Ground Zero.
- Apr. 2002: Each of the seven counties summarized their respective GIS programs
- Jul. 2002: Rollout of DataFinder Café, MetroGIS's state-of-the-art data distribution tool
- Oct. 2002: Metropolitan Airports Commission use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jan. 2003: Carver and Washington Counties' use of GIS for Emergency Management
- Apr. 2003: Metropolitan Mosquito Control District use of GIS and benefits from MetroGIS
- Jul. 2003: Minneapolis Neighborhood Information Network (MNIS) and its role in the area of Community GIS, also known as Public Participation GIS.

GASB 34 and GIS Technology: What is the Connection?

MetroGIS Policy Board Presentation

October 2003

GASB 34¹ is an accounting mandate for Government infrastructure assets. One purpose of the mandate is to make 'encourage' stewardship of infrastructure by public officials. Observance of this mandate by an agency requires a team approach, including the Finance Director and the Engineer. Compliance is flexible between two methods, the depreciation and the modified methods. Finance Directors prefer the former method because it appears easier. Unfortunately it has little residual value to engineers. The modified method has more value to engineers, but appears harder because it has no clear-cut 'formula'. Therefore, GASB 34 appears to be a problem without a solution.

Enter GIS. GIS, in many organizations a solution without a problem, has a role in GASB 34. The modified method starts with an infrastructure inventory, which includes asset presence and value. That inventory is the first step in an asset management system. A robust GIS is a cornerstone of an effective asset management system.

The purpose of the presentation is to quickly explain GASB 34, and to point out to the Policy Board the very large value of the existing infrastructure (and its proper stewardship) within the boundaries of MetroGIS. This knowledge can help government put a value on the benefit of GIS. It can also help point MetroGIS to its next endorsed data set and possibly to its next initiative.

¹ Governmental Accounting Standards Board, statement #34



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Major Activity Update

DATE: October 21, 2003
(For the Oct 29th Meeting)

A) REGIONAL MAILING LABEL APPLICATION

Based upon an application developed by Carver County, Alison Slaats, MetroGIS DataFinder Manager, developed a prototype regional mailing label, which runs on top of the regional parcel dataset. The County Data Producers Workgroup reported to the Policy Board on July 30th that it believes the application is technically feasible, though several inconsistencies among the respective county data components that comprise the regional parcel dataset were acknowledged and will need to be resolved to fully implement the application. Since July 30th, the Workgroup has concentrated on addressing concerns raised by some colleagues regarding potential effects on existing county revenue sources. As of the week of October 13th all of these concerns had been successfully addressed. Ms. Slaats has requested one final meeting with the Workgroup to clarify several remaining design matters prior to launching the application. Access to the application via the Internet will be limited to organizations that have current licenses to access the underlying parcel data. Dave Drealan, Carver County Planning Director, chairs this Workgroup.

B) COLLABORATIVE PARCEL DATA DISTRIBUTION STRATEGY - NON-GOVERNMENT ACCESS

At its January 2003 meeting, the Policy Board endorsed the core outcomes for the counties to collaboratively distribute the same regional parcel data (parcels boundaries plus 25 normalized attributes) to non-government interests that is currently being distributed to government interests. The County Data Producer Workgroup (of the Coordinating Committee) has made substantial progress to reach agreement among all counties to accomplish these outcomes:

- **Support a one-stop, Internet-enabled data order capability.** *Status:* The website was completed in March 2003 by Metropolitan Council staff, who are part of the MetroGIS staff support team. Actual deployment is awaiting county approval of related license policies (below).
- **Implement a common fee schedule.** *Background:* From February to September 2003, the Workgroup worked on development of a prototype common fee schedule, led by Dakota County's GIS Coordinator, that is eventually intended to apply to all seven counties. It incorporates significant price reductions from the current \$0.05/parcel through subscriptions and volume purchases and accommodates subsetting of the regional dataset. *The group concluded at its September 17th meeting that each county does not have to implement exactly the same fee schedule, given the substantive amount of change that has already occurred, to accomplish the main objective of this project – greatly streamline the data access process.* *Status:* Anoka, Carver, and Scott Counties have adopted the fee schedule proposed by the Workgroup. Washington County has endorsed it but it will not go into effect until January 1, 2004. Ramsey County is rewriting its entire fee schedule, which includes this proposal thus far, with a target for implementation of January 1, 2004. Hennepin County will be considering in late October proposed modifications that would bring its current parcel data fee structure (\$.08/parcel for numerous attributes) closer to the that proposed by the workgroup.
- **Implement a common license document, including the shrink-wrap concept to streamline the process.** *Background:* The Anoka County GIS Coordinator and County Attorney volunteered to draft a prototype license document to accomplish the desired streamlining of the process through use of the "shrink-wrap" concept and facilitate review by the other six counties.

Status: Six counties have approved the proposed License. Negotiations are in progress with the seventh.

C) INVESTIGATE DATA SHARING WITH UTILITIES

Representatives from Xcel Energy, CenterPoint Energy Minnegasco, and the Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative and the Chair of the County Data Producer Workgroup have mutually concluded there is merit to further investigating utilities accessing county parcel data, without fee, in return for sharing their utility facility locations aligned with the county-produced parcel data. It was agreed that the utility interests would each have an opportunity to evaluate the regional parcel dataset and then, if the data have value, both sides would further investigate how the data might be used on a longer-term basis. For instance, some government uses of the utility data include emergency management and right-of-way management. Some utility uses of parcel data include improving mapping accuracy of their facilities and improving operations that rely upon addresses. Delivery of a data sample to the utilities is expected to occur shortly.

D) ENHANCEMENTS TO DATAFINDER CAFÉ / MN GEOINTEGRATOR PROJECT

In June, the MN Land Management Information Center (LMIC) entered into a contract with a software development firm, financed in large part with an Office of Technology grant, to expand the functionality of MetroGIS DataFinder Café (www.datafinder.org/cafe.asp), and, in so doing, partner with the MetroGIS community to develop additional desired functionality for DataFinder Café and share long-term maintenance expenses. The Council, serving as MetroGIS's primary sponsor, has pledged a grant it received for a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NDSI) Web Mapping Services project to implement functionality being explored through this joint project and its current SafeSoft license for the FME software that provides critical functionality for DataFinder Café – "on the fly" conversion among several GIS formats. The October 13th delivery date has been postponed due to problems on the vendor's end. Hopefully all of these issues will be resolved in the next few weeks.

E) PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEEDS (See <http://www.metrogis.org/data/index.shtml> for complete information about the status of solutions for each of MetroGIS's common information needs.)

(1) Emergency Management Workgroup

The combined MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup and the Emergency Preparedness Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information held its third meeting on September 4. Three subgroups have also been formed and are meeting separately to focus on the specific areas of:

- Data Coordination, standards and development
- Build relationships with emergency management and response community
- Build awareness in GIS community and coordinate efforts between metro and state.

Regional Program coordinator, Kim Ketterhagen, from the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management, joined the group to discuss coordination of workgroup efforts with emergency managers. Several meeting and conference opportunities to make connections with the emergency management community were identified by Kim. Ron Wencil from the USGS also joined the workgroup to bring a national perspective on emergency preparedness issues. Coordination at all levels of government is key to effective preparation for emergencies.

Progress on short term goals include:

- A plan to assemble and access available emergency management data in the Metro area. This will be a first attempt at assembling emergency management data similar to the "stitching" together of parcel data that resulted in the MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset.
- A web-based form to help identify GIS professionals interested in using GIS in preparing for emergencies has been developed and was demonstrated at the GIS/LIS Conference October 8-10.
- A panel presentation was also made at the GIS/LIS Conference in St Paul.

Randy Knippel, Dakota County's GIS Manager, and Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council's GIS Manager, are co-chairing this workgroup.

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

The workgroup's main focus is to agree on the objectives for a series of pilot projects to determine what data model will work best for MetroGIS. Under consideration are the APA's Land-Based Classification Standard, enhancement of the MetroGIS Planned Land Use coding scheme, and a "Built Environment" database. Current workgroup members represent: city, county, school district, watershed district, metropolitan, and state interests. This workgroup is being facilitated by Paul Hanson with Metropolitan Council GIS staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

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

The Coordinating Committee, at its September 17th meeting, authorized creation of a work group to assess the applicability of currently proposed state-level standards by the Hydrology Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information for potential MetroGIS solutions. This group will be responsible to develop needed strategies to accommodate any desired modifications and assure that any modification will integrate with State data.

The Coordinating Committee also authorized separating the substance of the hydrologic information need into 4 to 5 sub-components that can be provided to users in a more timely and efficient manner than is currently in place. It also authorized modification of MetroGIS's general website (www.metrogis.org) to advertise for qualified organizations with a business need to step forward and facilitate the dialogue needed to address those priority information needs that thus far have not moved forward. This advertisement is to include a clear statement that no action will be taken to address these information needs until a willing and capable organization with a related business need assumes a leadership role.

(4) **Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas:**

This Workgroup has to completed its work to sort, organize, and prioritize information needs identified early on in MetroGIS's effort, which involve socioeconomic information and identifying desired data characteristics for each priority information need. At its meeting on October 28, the group expects to complete its work to identify information needs for which existing data sources are insufficient, as well as, those which can be satisfied with existing data sources and decide how to seek feedback from the broader user community on its conclusions. Thereafter, the group will begin drafting a recommendation(s) to implement a regional solution(s) for those priority common information needs that can be met with existing data sources and proposed next steps to address those that require additional data, such as more extensive data development options, including but not limited to, the iBlock concept developed by Excensus LLC.

Will Craig, member of the Coordinating Committee, chairs this workgroup. Eleven other individuals, representing diverse professional and organizational perspectives, including non-profits, city, county, school district, metropolitan, academic, state, and private sector interests comprise the group. This workgroup is being facilitated by Metropolitan Council staff assigned to support MetroGIS activities.

(5) **Highway and Road Networks**

The Roads and Highways Technical Workgroup has reached agreement on the goals, expectations, and the partner roles among the four major participants (MnDOT, MetroGIS, Metropolitan Council and The Lawrence Group) regarding the collaborative project endorsed by the Policy Board on July 30 to address the Highway and Road Networks Information Need. The goal of this project is to fully implement MnDOT's Location Data Manager (LDM) project, which has the potential to create a truly scalable, sharable road network for the region and the state. A document that explains the agreed upon goals, expectations, and participant roles can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/highway_roads/vision.pdf.

(6) **Regional Parcel Dataset Review Forum**

On September 25th, MetroGIS hosted a review forum for users of the Regional Parcel Dataset. The purpose of the forum was to identify desired enhancements the regional parcel dataset that would more completely meet business needs of the user base. Fourteen licensed parcel data users participated and six county representatives served as observers to help staff clarify the specific intent of suggested enhancements to the current regional solution. Fifty-six mutually exclusive suggested enhancements were identified, of which 26 received “votes” for regional significance. The top two priority needs of local and regional government are to add: residential structure characteristics and addresses for all units on a property. A complete listing of the suggested enhancements, in order of priority, and a summary of the entire half-day forum can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/index.shtml#enhance>.

A technical workgroup, comprised of GIS staff from each of the counties and staffed by Mark Kotz, who manages the area integrator functions for the regional parcel dataset, will evaluate each of the identified priorities to determine if the desired data can be acquired, options for initial acquisition, and which organization(s) is best suited for long term maintenance of the data. The results of the workgroup’s evaluation will be shared with the Coordinating Committee on December 17th and will establish the list of eligible data quality and/or access enhancement projects for 2004.



To: MetroGIS Policy Board

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

Subject: 2004 MetroGIS Policy Board Meeting Schedule

Date: October 16, 2003
(For Oct 29th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

A suggested meeting schedule for 2004 is presented below for the Board's consideration. No Board meetings have been scheduled beyond October 29, 2003. The meetings would continue to be held quarterly at the Metropolitan Council's Mears Park Centre offices in downtown St. Paul, beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Note: a 5th Wednesday occurred in each of the four months selected for meetings in 2003 and was chosen to minimize conflicts with other standing meetings. The 5th day of the month option is not available in 2004. Prior to 2003, the Policy Board generally met on the third or fourth Wednesdays of the month.

SUGGESTED 2004 MEETING SCHEDULE

<u>Suggested Meeting Date</u>	<u>Anticipated Major Topics</u>	<u>Possible GIS Demonstration</u>
Jan 28, 2004 <i>4th Wednesday</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2004 workplan objectives and budget • Regional Solution Socioeconomic Data – Phase I • Proposed Enhancements to Regional Parcel Dataset • Partnership with the State to Improve Functionality Of DataFinder Café And Extend Statewide 	Improving Information Access Efficiencies Across Departments Using GIS technology - Scott County's Experience
Apr 28, 2004 <i>4th Wednesday</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solution for Existing Land Use Information Need • Solution for Hydrology Information Need • Regional Geospatial Data Application Policy • Election of officers 	Small Area Socioeconomic Analysis – Importance to Local and Regional Government
Jul 28, 2004 <i>4th Wednesday</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solutions for School and Watershed District Jurisdictional Boundary Information Needs • Solution for Highway and Road Network Information Need 	Summary of current County GIS program capabilities
Oct 27, 2004 <i>4th Wednesday</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy to Identify Next Generation Priority Information Needs • Review Effectiveness of Pilot Distribution Policies/Mechanism for Regional Parcel Dataset (<i>Private Sector and Non-Profit Version</i>) 	??

RECOMMENDATION

The MetroGIS Policy Board is respectfully requested to set its meeting schedule for 2004.



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset - Modifications to Policy

DATE: October 16, 2003
(For the Oct 29th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee requests Policy Board approval to modify the Regional Policy Statement governing the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset (attached). The modification would change the update frequency from a vague statement that was often interpreted as annually to coincide with the quarterly update schedule for the regional parcel dataset. The seven counties serve as the primary custodians for both the parcel and the jurisdictional boundary data. The primary and regional custodians for the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset proposed this modification.

(Note. The language changes are illustrated in the attached Regional Policy Statement. The proposed new language is underlined and proposed language to be deleted is crossed out.)

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On September 17th, the Coordinating unanimously endorsed the proposed change in update frequency policy and directed staff to forward the recommended change to the Policy Board for approval.

The Committee also approved several non-substantive, format-type modifications to the language of the statement to bring it into conformance with the style of the more recently approved statements. The attached statement includes these modifications. For comparison, the earlier version of the policy statement is posted on the MetroGIS web site at http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/county_mcd/policy_summary.pdf. In April, the Policy Board granted authority to the Committee to modify adopted policy when the changes are unanimously approved by all affected and relevant parties, which was the case for these style-related language changes.

RATIONALE

The policy summary for the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset was the first regional policy statement enacted by MetroGIS, dating back to 1997. At that time, a quarterly update cycle was identified by the user community as desirable but the Metropolitan Council, acting in its capacity as the regional custodian, was not sure it could support more than annual updates. Since that time, the update process has been streamlined and, consequently, the Council's GIS unit (regional custodian) and the GIS units of each of the seven counties (primary custodians) are comfortable with this proposal to submit and incorporate updates to the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset, at the time updates are made to the Regional Parcel Dataset, on a quarterly basis.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board modify the Policy Statement for the Regional Municipal/County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset to stipulate a quarterly update policy that coincides with the Regional Parcel Dataset update cycle, as stipulated in the attached version of the policy statement, dated October 29, 2003.

REGIONAL MUNICIPAL & COUNTY JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES PRIORITY BUSINESS INFORMATION NEED POLICY SUMMARY

Data Specifications

A. Regional Dataset Specifications

The Regional Municipal and County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset shall comply with the following data specifications (October 24, 1997 action of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee). *Note: Policy Board action was not sought for data specifications, only custodian roles. MetroGIS was still evolving its decision-making process):*

- The dataset should be metro-wide.
- The dataset should provide metadata, entity and attribute information, unique identifiers, official map names, and contact information for each county, city or township.
- The horizontal datum should be NAD83.
- The dataset(s) should be in a format that can be converted to as many other formats as possible.
- The precisional accuracy of the jurisdictional boundaries must be derived from parcel layers, which are components of the MetroGIS endorsed regional parcel dataset and consistent with the positional accuracy requirements set forth in the policy statement for the regional parcel dataset, where the jurisdictional boundaries are coterminous with parcel boundaries.
- Use the U.S. Census Bureau's "FIPS" county and place name codes for MCDs (minor civil divisions) as standard MetroGIS codes for identifying counties, cities and townships and promote their use among MetroGIS stakeholders. *(Added via Policy Board action on July 28, 1999).*

B. Primary Data Capture Specifications

- 1) The seven metro area counties each agreed, prior to Policy Board endorsement on January 26, 2000, to abide by the MCD (minor civil division) jurisdictional boundary guidelines developed by Washington County when serving in their role as primary custodians (see below) for the Regional Municipal and County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset, with the understanding that these guidelines are intended to be improved and enhanced over time. See <http://www.co.washington.mn.us/mgmtsrvy/muniboun.htm> for the guidelines developed by Washington County.
- 2) The MetroGIS Policy Board agreed in its January 26, 2000 action that it is MetroGIS's responsibility to promote use of the guidelines developed by Washington County by each of the seven counties in their roles as primary producers of Municipal and County Jurisdictional Boundary data.

Roles and Responsibilities

The following Custodian Roles and Responsibilities pertaining to MetroGIS's regional Municipal and County Jurisdictional Boundary Dataset are hereby endorsed by the MetroGIS Policy Board to govern management of the Regional Municipal and County Jurisdictional Boundaries Dataset. This action affects each of the seven metro area counties and the Metropolitan Council. Management representatives to the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee from each of these organizations endorsed this policy prior to Policy Board action.

A. Primary Custodian(s)

Each of the individual seven metro area counties..

B. Primary Custodian Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the *primary custodians* are as follows:

1. Make corrections to the primary dataset when changes in the boundaries occur.
2. Submit an updated dataset (municipal and county jurisdictional boundaries) for their entire jurisdiction to the regional custodian quarterly, on the same schedule as updates are submitted for the regional parcel dataset. If no changes have been made to the dataset that quarter, no update is necessary.
3. Assist the regional custodian maintain metadata for the dataset.
4. To the extent possible, use the relevant guidelines recommended by MetroGIS.

C. Region Custodian

The Metropolitan Council

D. Regional Custodian Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the *regional custodian* are as follows:

1. Compile a regional coverage of municipal and township boundaries from the primary sources.
2. Compile metadata from all primary sources into one set of metadata for the regional dataset and encourage creation, enhancement, and maintenance of standardized metadata from each of the primary custodians, in particular for the accuracy of the boundaries.
3. Re-compile the regional coverage on a quarterly basis from data provided by the primary custodians ~~when significant changes are made to the primary sources.~~
4. Encourage use of relevant data standards endorsed by MetroGIS for the primary data custodians.
5. Provide for data archive, backup, retrieval, and disaster recovery.
6. Facilitate resolution of matters involving intellectual property rights in terms of data distribution policies.



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: 2004 Preliminary Budget and Agreement Principles

DATE: October 21, 2003
(For the Oct 29th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

This report requests Policy Board consideration of two related topics:

- 1) Review and comment is requested concerning the proposed 2004 budget (attached) for MetroGIS.
- 2) Approval is requested for several principles (attached) that are proposed to guide allocation of the funds for data quality and access enhancement projects financed by MetroGIS.

BACKGROUND

1. The proposed funding is adequate to accomplish the tasks presented in the proposed workplan (See Agenda Item 6d). The Metropolitan Council has accepted for public hearing, the proposed budget total, which calls for 3 FTE in staff support and \$86,000 in non-staff project funding. The hearing will occur in December. Refer to attached funding balance sheet and detailed budget documents for the specifics. This is the same level of support that was accepted by the Policy Board at its April 2003 meeting. Once the Council's budget is finalized in December, final action by the Policy Board on the proposed 2004 workplan (Item 6d) and the attached budget. These actions are currently anticipated to occur at the Board's January 2004 meeting.
2. The vast majority of the enhancement project funds proposed in MetroGIS's 2004 budget are expected to be used to address parcel-related information needs. Counties produce parcel data and are, therefore, expected to be involved in these enhancement projects. This project funding also affects the negotiations to extend current data sharing agreements with counties, which expire on December 31, 2003.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On September 17th, the attached budget documents were shared with Coordinating Committee for comment. No changes were suggested. Subsequently, during negotiations with Chairperson Reinhardt and management representatives from the seven counties concerning the Next Generation Data Sharing Agreements, the need for principles upon which to base the allocation of MetroGIS's \$50,000 in proposed data quality and access enhancement funds was recognized. Board approval of the proposed principles is sought at this time to ensure the agreements are well grounded in principles acceptable to all relevant and affected parties and dominated by none – also a MetroGIS principle of long standing.

MAJOR 2004 BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

In keeping with MetroGIS's three core functions (regional solutions to commonly needed data, an efficient mechanism to share data (DataFinder), and fostering knowledge sharing), the proposed allocation of funds is as follows (see the attached detailed budget for information about the proposed allocation of funds by activity):

1. \$50,000 for data quality and access enhancements important to the broad MetroGIS community. The projects will be defined through user forums (i.e. parcel forum on September 25th and Street Centerline Forum in Spring 2004). Board approval is sought for attached principles to guide allocation of these funds.
2. \$23,500 for outreach, fostering knowledge sharing, policy planning, and performance measures activities.
3. \$12,500 for software maintenance and enhancement of DataFinder functions.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. The Metropolitan Council will approve funding adequate to support MetroGIS's core functions.

2. An agreement will be in place with each of the seven counties prior to January 1, 2004 to maintain access without fee by government and academic interests to parcel data.
3. Agreed upon roles and responsibilities for support of MetroGIS-endorsed regional solutions, which have been accepted by qualified stakeholder organizations, will continue to be performed in accordance with expectations.
4. A partnership with LMIC is in place to share the expenses associated with supporting DataFinder.
5. Supplemental professional services (communications, performance measures, business strategies, etc.) can be retained within the amounts budgeted. RFP's are currently in progress.
6. The County Data Producer Workgroup will complete its work on the following tasks in 2003:
 - Regional mailing label application
 - Collaborative mechanism to distribute parcel data to non-government interests.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board:

- 1) Identify any issues or concerns with the proposed budget allocations for 2004.
- 2) Approve the principles presented in the attachment dated October 21, 2003 to guide allocation of funding for data quality and access enhancement projects.

Principles For Allocating MetroGIS's Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funds

Introduction

The following principles are to serve as the basis for allocating a portion of the MetroGIS budget to data producers, serving in their role as primary custodians for data that comprise regional data solutions (e.g. counties related to parcel data). They are intended to supplement and expand upon, not supercede, the more general principles¹ that have governed MetroGIS's efforts for some time.

Data Quality and Access Enhancement Funding Principles

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

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

¹ The following principles governed MetroGIS's efforts. They have evolved over time as a product of decision-making and desired outcomes.

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

MetroGIS					
Funding Balance Sheet					
Revenue Sources		2001	2002	2003 ⁽¹⁾	2004
		Actual	Actual	Approved	Preliminary
Metropolitan Council Resources:					
Staff <i>(Reduced from 3.25 FTE to 3.0 FTE July 2003)</i>		\$213,000	\$207,000	\$213,000	\$200,000
Non staff - excluding supplemental data maintenance/enhancement funds		\$115,000	\$90,000	\$37,750	\$23,500
Data Quality and Access Enhancements - Individual and Collaborative Projects ⁽²⁾		\$75,000	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
DataFinder Enhancements/Support			<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$12,750</u>	<u>\$12,500</u>
	Subtotal	\$403,000	\$382,000	\$313,500	\$286,000
Grant Funds:					
NSDI Web Services Grant - Partnership with LMIC			<u>\$3,700</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>	
	Subtotal	\$0	\$3,700	\$15,000	\$0
Other:					
Funds donated to MetroGIS from data sales - total \$25,538 ⁽³⁾		\$1,245	\$20,505	\$3,788	\$0
DataFinder Enhancement Partnership with LMIC (in addition to grant)				\$22,000	TBD
	Subtotal	\$1,245	\$20,505	\$25,788	
	GRAND TOTAL	\$404,245	\$406,205	\$354,288	\$286,000
Notes:					
⁽¹⁾ \$49,500 reduction from October 2002 Metropolitan Council budget for 2003 in response to the State's \$4.5 billion revenue shortfall projection.					
⁽²⁾ Funds to be used to compensate producers of regionally significant data/applications to support enhancements of significance to the MetroGIS community and perform data custodian tasks which exceed internal business needs.					
⁽³⁾ A custodial fund was set up in 1998 at the Metropolitan Council to receive, manage and disburse donated funds. These donated funds accumulated from 1997 through 2000 from sales of TLG Street Centerline & 1997 Orthoimagery data. No additional donations are anticipated. A total of \$25,538 was received of which \$3,788 remained as of 12/31/02. The funds that have been spent were used to develop DataFinder Café, in accordance with Board approval.					

MetroGIS Preliminary Detailed Budget Allocations 2004-2005

	A	B	C	D
1	(Estimates do not include staff support costs. Projects supported entirely by staff-only expenses are not included.)			
2	See the adopted work plans for all proposed activities.)			
3				
4	<i>Several explanatory Notes, by cell, are provide following the table</i>			
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function	2002	2003	2004
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)	Authorized	Authorized	Proposed
7				
8	I. MISSION CRITICAL FUNCTION			
9	1. Promote and endorse voluntary policies which foster coordination of GIS among the region's organizations			
10	a) Support Teams, Committees and Board			
11	i. Copying, postage, local travel, room rental, etc.			
12	ii. Supplemental staff support (outsource) strategic and business planning, business information needs activities, performance measures, and special studies.	\$67,500	\$15,000	\$15,000
13	b) Participant appreciation function	\$5,000	N/A	N/A
14	c) Outreach			
15	i. Printing - Annual Report/Promotional Brochure. Assume no other printed materials for handouts.	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$500
16	ii. Communications Outsourcing/Supplemental Staff Support	N/A	\$2,500	\$2,000
17	iii. Copying, postage, local travel			
18	2. Facilitate data sharing agreements and licensing among MetroGIS stakeholders			
19	a) Establish long-term partnerships with producer of data important to addressing priority common information needs (data and applications) of the MetroGIS community to collaboratively enhance the quality of commonly needed data and improve access consistent with broad stakeholder needs consistent with the internal business needs of the producer. Data sharing and maintenance agreements with the seven metro area counties for widespread access to parcel and related data along with the agreement with The Lawrence Group (TLG) for widespread access to street centerline data both have served as fundamental components of MetroGIS's regional solution strategy since early in the evolution of MetroGIS due to the importance of these data to the stakeholder community. As MetroGIS's efforts to address a broader range of priority information needs come into play, a principle-based scheme will be needed to determine how to allocate these funds among the variety of data producers that are anticipated will be involved.	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
20	3. Provide a directory of data within the regional and a mechanism for search and retrieval of GIS data. (The goal is to provide a single access point with information on how to search for sources of data.)			
21	a) Project Funds to enhance DataFinder functionality (<i>Expand geographic search capability, develop applications/scripts, etc. to enhance & improve on-line access, support/outsource technical and administrative services to distribute regional datasets (may include hardware and software), etc.</i> \$15,000 NSDI Web Mapping Service Grant funding planned in 2003 for GML enhancement via partnership with LMIC for \$37,000 project. No other use can be made of these funds. Assumes a partnership beginning Fall 2003 with LMIC to host DataFinder on state system and share cost of improvements and ongoing maintenance.	\$10,000	\$12,750	\$10,000
22	b) Contractor and software maintenance contracts & related certificates to support the Internet-Enabled Data Distribution Mechanism (DataFinder)	\$0	\$12,000	\$2,500

MetroGIS Preliminary Detailed Budget Allocations 2004-2005

	A	B	C	D
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function	2002	2003	2004
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)	Authorized	Authorized	Proposed
23	4. Identify unmet GIS needs with regional significance and act on these needs			
24	a) MetroGIS data users forums and Business Information Need Peer Review Forums	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$500
25	b) Participant satisfaction survey	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
26	c) Seed \$'s for regionally significant projects	(See I-2 and I-3)	(See I-2 and I-3)	(See I-2 and I-3)
27	d) Identify Second Generation Business Information Need Priorities			\$1,000
28	5) Develop and endorse standards for GIS content, data documentation, and data management for regional data sets. (In addition to normal operating expenses covered as committee expenses).	[Refer to III 1(a)]		[Refer to III 1(a)]
29	a) Negotiate agreements	(See I-2)	(See I-2)	(See I-2)
30	b) Facilitate compliance (training sessions, sharing best practices, etc)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)	(See II-3a)
31	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$164,000	\$96,250	\$83,000
32				
33	II. FUNDED SUPPORT: IMPORTANT BUT NOT CRITICAL			
34	1. Maintain MetroGIS world wide web site (not DataFinder)	\$380	\$0	\$0
35	2. Promote collaborative funding of pilot projects that meet regional needs	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)
36	3. Fill gaps in metadata based on identified priorities			
37	a) Promote/facilitate development and maintenance of metadata & posting with DataFinder (including education forums and one-on-one contact)	\$250	\$0	\$250
38	4. Maintain liaison relationships with committees/organizations with similar objectives to MetroGIS (e.g., Governor's Council on GI, county GIS user groups, MACO, NACO). See 6b for NSDI/GDA expenses.			
39	5. Promote forums for MetroGIS stakeholders to discuss common GIS needs and opportunities			
40	a) Workshops for managers/policy makers to prepare for upcoming legislative session, training related to endorsed regional data solutions, etc.	NA	N/A	N/A
41	b) Assist County User Groups with special functions that promote the principles of MetroGIS	\$3,000	\$0	See II-5 (c)
42	c) Facilitate regionwide users groups/forums for knowledge sharing		\$2,500	\$2,000
43	6. Advocate for MetroGIS needs and desires with state and federal policy makers			
44	a) Pursue authorities (legislation)/policies necessary to achieve MetroGIS objectives (organizational/data access & privacy/long term financing/etc.) (Decision in 1998 to rely upon in-house legal staff/grants)	N/A		N/A
45	b) Participate in non-local Workshops/Activities			
46	i) GDA National Board of Trustees – Policy Board Chairperson Reinhardt and Staff Coordinator	\$6,500	\$0	\$0
47	ii) GDA Membership Dues (authorized by Board July 11, 2001)	\$250	\$250	\$0
48	iii) NSDI / I-Team etc. related activities not paid by host.		\$1,500	\$750
49	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$10,380	\$4,250	\$3,000
50				
51	III. PARTNERED SUPPORT: HIGH IMPORTANCE BUT REQUIRE PARTNERING TO ACHIEVE			

MetroGIS Preliminary Detailed Budget Allocations 2004-2005

	A	B	C	D
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function	2002	2003	2004
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)	Authorized	Authorized	Proposed
52	1. Create and maintain datasets for MetroGIS based upon identified priorities (i.e., to address 13 priority information needs endorsed by the Policy Board 5/97 as having regional significance. (All expenses covered in I-4(a & d). See work plans for specifics)			
53	a) Develop regional data sets	See Assumption	See Assumption	See Assumption
54	<u>Business Plan Assumption:</u> MetroGIS endorsed datasets are to be developed by stakeholder organizations with business need & in some cases TBD joint ventures			
55	b) Maintenance of Regional Datasets	See Assumption	See Assumption	See Assumption
56	<u>Business Plan Assumption:</u> Maintained by org/partnership with business need			
57	2. Help promote development and exchange of GIS applications and procedures that serve MetroGIS needs	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)	See I-2(a) and I-3(a)
58	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
59				
60	IV. CASE BY CASE			
61	1. Develop master contracts for regional GIS projects, when appropriate	[See I(1) and I(2)]	[See I(1) and I(2)]	[See I(1) and I(2)]
62	2. Endorse standards for telecommunication protocol and networks (AKA: create guidelines for getting electronic access to the information that is being shared)	\$0	\$0	\$0
63	3. Provide technical assistance to participants to retrieve, translate, and use data developed and maintained on behalf of MetroGIS	(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)	(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)	(Staff function) See II(3) & (5)
64	4. Undertake research to meet common regional GIS needs	(See I-4)	(See I-4)	(See I-4)
65	a) Benefits of Data Sharing/Collaboration (component of outsourced activities pertaining to Performance Measures)	[See I(1)(a)(ii)]	[See I(1)(a)(ii)]	[See I(1)(a)(ii)]
66	b) TBD Project(s) identified in Participant Satisfaction Survey	[See I-4(b)]	[See I-4(b)]	[See I-4(b)]
67	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
68				
69	V. LOW PRIORITY			
70	1. Identify GIS training and continuing education needs and encourage participation	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
71	2. Provide a repository of GIS human resources information (centralized job posting/position descriptions)	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)	(Rely on other organizations)
72	3. Actively Market MetroGIS data and products. (Year 2000 ranking exercise when still in the midst of building functionality) (See Outreach Activities)	(See I-1 and note)	(See I-1 and note)	(See I-1 and note)
73	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$0	\$0	\$0
74				
75	ADMINISTRATIVE			
76	a) GIS/Professional Development Conferences	N/A	N/A	N/A
77	b) Register "MetroGIS" and "MetroGIS DataFinder" names with federal and state gov'ts	\$620	(Completed 2002)	(Completed 2002)
78	SUBTOTAL (Does not include staff expenses)	\$620	\$0	\$0
79				
80	YEAR	2002	2003	2004
81				
82	METROPOLITAN COUNCIL			
83	NON-STAFF - EXCEPT DATA/ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS	\$90,000	\$25,750	\$23,500
84	DATA QUALITY & ACCESS ENHANCEMENTS WITH REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE [I-2(a)]	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
85	DATAFINDER ENHANCEMENTS/SUPPORT	\$10,000	\$24,750	\$12,500

**MetroGIS Preliminary Detailed Budget Allocations
2004-2005**

	A	B	C	D
5	MetroGIS Coordination Function	2002	2003	2004
6	(Categories and first level functions as presented in Business Plan adopted by the MetroGIS Policy Board Apr. 26, 2000)	Authorized	Authorized	Proposed
86	TOTAL NON-STAFF	\$175,000	\$100,500	\$86,000
87	STAFF (3.0 FTE Dedicated to MetroGIS 2003-2005 down from 3.25 in 2002)**	\$207,000	\$213,000	\$200,000
88	SUBTOTAL	\$382,000	\$313,500	\$286,000
89				
90	OTHER FUNDING SOURCES			
91	NSDI Web Services Grant (Total award \$18,700)	\$3,700	\$15,000	
92	LMIC Partnership - DataFinder Enhancement		\$22,000	TBD
93	12/31/01:	\$20,505	\$3,788	\$0
94	GRAND TOTAL			
95		\$406,205	\$354,288	\$286,000
96	Oct 1, 2003 salaries assumed			



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: 2004 Major Program Objectives for MetroGIS

DATE: October 21, 2003
(For the Oct 29th Meeting)

INTRODUCTION

The Coordinating Committee requests Policy Board comment on the attached one-page draft of major program objectives for MetroGIS in 2004. Final approval will be sought at the Board's January meeting, once the budget is finalized. This report is intended to be considered in conjunction with the report explaining the proposed budget (Agenda Item 6c).

The purpose of this preliminary review request is to make sure that all major program objectives desired by the Policy Board and related resource needs are identified and clearly understood by the Committee prior to finalizing the proposal.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At its meeting on September 17th, the Coordinating Committee unanimously:

- ◆ Accepted the attached one-page summary of major program objectives for 2004 for Policy Board review and comment.
- ◆ Accepted a detailed workplan, which sets forth individual tasks necessary to achieve these proposed major program objectives. *The detailed work plan is available for review upon request.*
- ◆ Modified the purpose statement for the Technical Advisory Team, which advises the Committee, to reflect its evolution into primarily a knowledge sharing forum as opposed to a committee that recommends course of action for specified issues and opportunities. This action also recognized that special purpose workgroups have been the norm for some time and are satisfactorily advising the Committee on courses of action to address a variety of technical matters.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS

1. The Metropolitan Council will approve funding adequate to support MetroGIS's core functions.
2. An agreement will be in place with each of the seven counties prior to January 1, 2004 to maintain access to parcel data, without fee, by government and academic interests.
3. Agreed upon roles and responsibilities for support of MetroGIS endorsed regional solutions, which have been accepted by stakeholder organizations, will continue to be performed in accordance with expectations.
4. A partnership with LMIC is in place to share the expenses associated with supporting DataFinder.
5. Supplemental professional services (communications, performance measures, business strategies, etc.) can be retained within the amounts budgeted. RFP's are currently in progress.
6. The County Data Producer Workgroup will complete its work on the following tasks in 2003:
 - Regional mailing label application
 - Collaborative mechanism to distribute parcel data to non-government interests.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Policy Board identify any additions or modifications it desires concerning the draft major program objectives for MetroGIS in 2004.

MetroGIS Mission Statement

(Adopted February 1996)

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

Major 2004 MetroGIS Program Objectives

- Make substantive progress toward comprehensive regional solutions for the following common priority information needs:
 - 1) Emergency management preparedness
 - 2) Existing land use
 - 3) Highways and roads
 - 4) Jurisdictional boundaries – school districts
 - 5) Jurisdictional boundaries – watershed districts
 - 6) Lakes and wetlands
 - 7) Socioeconomic characteristics of areas
- In partnership with the State of Minnesota, support MetroGIS DataFinder as part of the State’s geospatial data infrastructure and jointly pursue desired improvements important to the MetroGIS community.
- Implement strategies to achieve desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset, regional street centerline dataset, and DataFinder, including investigating access by non-profits/community groups whose functions complement government functions.
- Identify commonly needed geospatial applications appropriate for regional solutions and MetroGIS’s resources.
- Execute activities defined in the Performance Measures Plan to monitor effectiveness of MetroGIS efforts – user satisfaction with solutions and custodian conformance with expectations; document the benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts; and modify activities and policies as appropriate.
- Monitor market interest and satisfaction with the collaborative mechanism implemented in 2003 by the seven metro counties to collaboratively distribute parcel data to non-government interests via a common set of procedures and a centralized method to receive data requests and implement policy and procedure modifications as appropriate.
- Continue a strong emphasis on outreach activities with MetroGIS stakeholders and related efforts beyond the Metro Area.
- Maintain currency of www.metrogis.org website for organizational information about MetroGIS.
- Maintain currency of www.datafinder.org website for access to over 100 GIS data files.

**It is recognized that these objectives may need to be modified if funding is reduced in response to the state’s continuing revenue shortfalls.



TO: Policy Board

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

SUBJECT: Information Sharing

DATE: October 22, 2003
(For the Oct. 29th Meeting)

a) PolicyLink Recommendations to the Minneapolis Foundation – Towards a Regional Strategy for Sustaining Community Focused GIS in Twin Cities Metro Area

On May 20th, the Urban Coalition, The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association, Project 504, and the Minneapolis Foundation hosted a conference on “*Community GIS: Strategies For Enhancing Mapping Projects In The Twin Cities Region*”. Following the conference, PolicyLink conducted a series of interviews with organizations active in promoting use of GIS technology in the region to identify needs and opportunities for using GIS as a tool for community building and promoting regional equity. Two of the recommendations propose that: 1) the current MetroGIS-related data sharing agreements pertaining to the parcel and street centerline data should be expanded to make these data available to non-profits and community organizations via DataFinder and b) the feasibility of a regional web-based GIS application should be investigated. Both are currently among MetroGIS’s proposed 2004 work program activities, with the exception of access to the TLG Street Centerline dataset, which should be negotiated directly with The Lawrence Group (TLG). These recommendations are tentatively planned to be shared with the Coordinating Committee for direction on December 17th as to how MetroGIS should respond to recommendations that are within its purview.

b) New MetroGIS Benefits Testimonial – SRF Consulting Group

A 6th testimonial to the benefits of MetroGIS’s efforts has been received. The SRF Consulting Group, headquartered in Plymouth, was the subject. SRF provides a variety of transportation planning, community development, and related construction services to cities and counties in the metro area. The testimonial can be viewed at <http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/testimonials/srf.pdf>. According to Bob Diedrich, Senior GIS Specialist with SRF, “the regional datasets made available through MetroGIS, and the ease with which they can be acquired through DataFinder Café, create productivity gains and cost savings for SRF, which in turn means reduced costs for our clients”. A project for which they were hired by Carver and Scott Counties was cited as a recent success in large part due to MetroGIS’s efforts to support regional datasets and DataFinder, an Internet-based data discovery and distribution tool.

c) Clarification – Planned Land Use Coding for Commuter Rail

On July 30, 2003, the Board unanimously approved adding a “Rail Transit Way” code to the Regional Planned Land Use dataset but requested further definition of the new land use designation. The Board thought additional clarification was needed to distinguish passenger rail transit from other forms of freight rail transportation. The new “Rail Transit Way” designation is intended to include all railways used solely for passenger transportation: light rail transit and commuter rail. Commuter rail service occurring on functioning freight-service rail will retain the current “Rail Corridor” designation. As such, in response to the Board’s direction, the Regional Planned Land Use metadata has been modified to reflect the needed clarification. The metadata records now read as follows:

RLW: Railway Corridor - An area or strip of land occupied or intended to be occupied by freight-service rail or other similar use. Includes rail that may support passenger commuter rail.

RTW: Rail Transit Way – An area or strip of land occupied or intended to be occupied only by passenger rail or other similar uses. Includes light rail transit (LRT) and commuter rail.

d) Presentations / Outreach / Studies (*not mentioned elsewhere*)

The following activities occurred since the Policy Board last met. (*Note, due to budget cuts, no out-of-state travel is permitted and therefore staff was unable to attend the National URISA Conference held in mid-October.*).

- Macomb, Michigan Interest in DataFinder - August
- Metro 911 Board Project to Incorporate GIS Technology into PSAP Operations
- Scott County GIS Users Group – September 24th
- Regional Parcel Data Users Forum - September 25th
- GIS/LIS State Conference – October 8-10
- U of M Graduate Geography Seminar – October 20th
- Proposed DataFinder Education Forum - January 2004

Metro 911 Board Project to Incorporate GIS Technology into PSAP Operations

The Metro 911 Board has launched a project to integrate GIS technology into the day-to-day work of PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points - dispatching facilities). MetroGIS and Metropolitan Council GIS staff assisted the Metro 911 Board develop a Request for Information to initiate the project. The Board wanted to insure that MetroGIS's efforts are not duplicated and that investments made by the MetroGIS community are leveraged to the maximum extent possible. In September, nine responses were received, several of them excellent, according to Pete Eggimann, Metro 911 Board staff and project manager. These responses provided adequate information for the Board to authorize the project. MetroGIS support staff have been subsequently invited to participate on the Board's mapping/GIS subcommittee tasked with fleshing out the operational specifications for the project. The first meeting was held on October 15th. The next meeting was to be held on October 27th.

As a result of the dialogue that has been established between MetroGIS and the Metro 911 Board, the Board has agreed to share two regional datasets (PSAP and Emergency Service Number Boundaries) with the MetroGIS community that it recently developed with the assistance of the Minnesota Land Management Information Center. Each addresses common needs identified in 1996 by the MetroGIS community. To view the metadata for these datasets, go to <http://www.datafinder.org/catalog.asp#Social,%20Justice%20and%20Emergency%20Services>. They also available via DataFinder.

GIS/LIS Conference

On October 8th Rick Gelbmann and Randy Knippel, co-chairs of MetroGIS's Emergency Management Information Need Workgroup, presented a half-day workshop at the State GIS/LIS Conference. They also presented a 1-1/2 hour educational session on October 10th at the same conference. They shared the objectives of their committee's work, the relationship with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information committee which they also co-chair, activities in progress, and the processes anticipated used to accomplish the planned objectives.

Scott County GIS Users Group

On September 24th, the Staff Coordinator presented an overview of MetroGIS's vision, functions, accomplishments, and challenges to the Scott County GIS Users Group. In accordance with direction received from the Policy Board following a similar presentation to the Board on July 30th, staff requested an opportunity to share this information with each of the user groups as their agendas permit. The Hennepin County User Group has requested a presentation at its January meeting. Following a presentation by the Scott County Recorder and members of the Scott County GIS Office, the Staff Coordinator invited them to consider presenting their successes in implementing a robust,

coordinated Internet mechanism for easy access to data produced by the Assessor, Recorder, and Surveyor offices.

Regional Parcel Data Users Forum

See the report for Agenda Item 5e(1).

U of M Graduate Geography Seminar

The Staff Coordinator presented an overview of MetroGIS's vision, functions, accomplishments, and challenges to a graduate level class at the U of M that is part of the Masters in GIS curriculum. Staff has been asked to make this presentation on four previous occasions.

Proposed DataFinder Educational Forum

A forum is tentatively scheduled for January 2004 to explain the services provided by DataFinder and its relationship with the state's GeoIntegrator project. LMIC has been asked to co-host this forum. The primary audience will be producers of data commonly used by other organizations. The purpose is to encourage posting of more metadata records by more producers on DataFinder. MetroGIS is obligated to host this event as a condition of grant funding received in 2001 to implement Web Mapping/Feature Service technology as a component of DataFinder. A partnership with LMIC was sought to achieve this objective.

Macomb County, Michigan Interest in DataFinder

At the suggestion of Syncline, the firm that assisted with the development of MetroGIS DataFinder Café, Macomb County, Michigan managers interviewed MetroGIS staff on August 28th. During the interview they agreed to share with us the information they received from their investigation of online GIS applications/WMS and data distribution options.

e) State Geospatial Initiatives Update

1) I-Teams / Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI)

The Staff Coordinator and David Arbeit, with LMIC and a member of the Coordinating Committee, are serving on the Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (SDI) Committee of the Governor's Council on Geographic Information. The Committee is responsible for consolidating all of Minnesota's individual, theme-based I-Plans in a document that sets forth a cohesive strategy to guide investments in geospatial technology and data within Minnesota. Plans for the 8 initial "framework" data themes are in various stages of completion. A "wrapper" document that provides context for the individual plans within a broader vision is under development by SDI Committee. The target is to consolidate all of the individual I-Plans into to a single document for submission to the federal Office of Management and Budget by year-end.

2) Emergency Preparedness

See the report for Agenda Item 5(b)1.

3) Statewide Parcel Inventory Complete

An inventory of digital parcel mapping across the state was recently completed. Some 33 counties have 75% or more of their parcels in digital format: this includes all of the Metro counties and the collar counties of Isanti, Rice, Sherburne, and Wright. Chisago and Goodhue are well underway, but no digital mapping is underway in LeSueur, Meeker, or Sibley. The inventory was developed for Mn/DOT by CURA at the University of Minnesota and ProWest & Associates. Inventory details are available at <http://rocky.dot.state.mn.us/SPMI/>.

4) New Statewide Orthoimagery Partnership

The state recently completed an agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Farm Services Agency (FSA) that will result in new digital orthophotography for all of Minnesota. The new agreement, coordinated by the Land Management Information Center and funded by the Department of Transportation, Pollution Control Agency, and the Department of Natural Resources, leverages \$250,000 in state funds to produce orthophotos costing almost \$2 million to produce. In return for the contribution, the state will receive copies of 1-meter, natural color

digital images. Flights began in May and continued through the summer in order to meet the FSA's need for images during the growing season. When they become available in late 2003, LMIC plans to offer compressed image files for download at no charge and in other formats on request for a modest service fee. For more about this program, see www.lmic.state.mn.us/chouse/airphoto_usda.html.

f) Federal/National Geospatial Initiatives Update

1) **I-Teams** - See item d1, above.

2) **3C's Task Force**

The Staff Coordinator participated on the URISA (Urban and Regional Information Systems Association) 3C's (Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration) Task Force that hosted a summit in Washington D.C. on May 20th. The purpose was to facilitate and foster better understanding by local and state officials of several prominent federal programs that directly impact the geospatial community. The results of the May 20th Summit were summarized by the Task Force and presented at the October URISA Conference in Atlanta for further discussion. The results of the discussions at the URISA conference will be passed along when received. (MetroGIS staff did not attend the URISA Conference due to budget cuts.)

g) News from the Private Sector:

The Lawrence Group is proud to announce the launch of its NEW online mapping application. This application brings their King's Street Atlas online to atlas users. Jim Maxwell programmed this application using Arc IMS tools and completed it in approximately six months. If you purchase a 2004 King's Street Atlas you get one year's free access. This application is password protected and allows the user to search for addresses, streets, parks, lakes, golf courses, etc. There are many layers of additional information that can be turned on or turned off. This application also lets you identify features using symbols and text boxes. Map pages are fully printable. Visit their web site at: www.kingscompanion.com for more information.

g) SEPTEMBER 17TH COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

See http://www.metrogis.org/teams/cc/index.shtml#agendas_minutes