

# **MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team** **2003 Work Program Working Document**

## **The Scope of Our Work...**

### **TAT Purpose Statement:**

The MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team is responsible for:

- a) recommending technical strategies and mechanisms and
- b) framing policy needs for consideration by the Coordinating Committee related to resolving data access, data content, and standards obstacles that must be overcome to achieve widespread sharing of geographically-referenced data among MetroGIS stakeholders.

### **Responsibilities:**

- Identify the datasets and their characteristics which provide the greatest utility for the Metro Area GIS data user community.
- Identify or develop standards and/or guidelines that facilitate data sharing among participants of MetroGIS.
- Identify policy needs concerning content of priority regional datasets.
- Identify and frame policy issues concerning delivery and access of data endorsed by MetroGIS as regionally significant.
- Monitor and evaluate user satisfaction with MetroGIS-endorsed datasets.
- Monitor and evaluate user satisfaction with MetroGIS DataFinder's functionality.
- Remain current regarding Geographic Information Systems technology and related capabilities especially as they apply to the needs of the MetroGIS community.

## **The Structure for Assigning Work.....**

### **Workgroups:**

Much of the work of identifying and evaluating options will be accomplished through special purpose, topic-specific, workgroups created by the Team. The Team's primary duty will be to direct and coordinate the work of its special purpose information need workgroups, ad-hoc workgroups, consultants, and staff to accomplish the Team's assigned responsibilities and tasks. Depending on the topic, special purpose workgroups, once created, may report their findings directly to the Coordinating Committee to expedite the decision-making process

## **What the Coordinating Committee has asked us to do this year.....**

### **TAT Tasks for 2003**

The TAT has three main categories of work for 2003.

1. Recommend solutions to Priority Business Information Needs.
2. Enhance access to shared data (DataFinder).
3. Monitor customer needs and satisfaction and recommend appropriate courses of action.

A table of specific tasks follows. A description of the general responsibilities of each category is listed below the 2003 TAT Work Plan. A listing of detailed expectations for each major responsibility follows the Work Plan.

## 2003 Technical Advisory Team Tasks

The support staff would prefer a "Lead TAT Member" assigned to most tasks. This person would be responsible for ensuring that the task is completed and would also report progress back to the Team. These "Leads" do not necessarily have to do the work, but do need to monitor it. If no TAT member is willing to act as the Lead for a particular task, then perhaps there is a need to look outside of the TAT for a new member who will. If no new member can be found to accept this responsibility, then perhaps it should be recognized that the TAT is not involved with the task.

### Solutions to Priority Common Information Needs

Task	Who is Working on This? (Lead TAT Member (if any) in Bold) Other workgroup members do not have to be part of TAT	Work Group Status	Start/End
Regional Lakes, Wetlands, etc Information Need	<b>Susanne Maeder</b> (LMIC) Paul Hanson (Met. Council) <i>Liaison with state initiative.</i> Coordinate with GCGI committee.	Workgroup authorized but not formed	Jan 00 - ?
(A) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Information Need  Phase II Accessibility Enhancement tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Add tract profile data when it becomes available (boundaries already exist on DataFinder)</li> <li>▪ Minneapolis &amp; St Paul neighborhood profile data gets posted by those cities.</li> </ul>	Will Craig (U of M)???	Yes (Same group that worked on Phase I)	Jan 03 - ?  (Phase I Accessibility Enhancements completed in 2002)
(B) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Information Need <i>(Evaluate the needs statements produced in the 1996 Business Object Framing Modeling exercise related to this information need against the data available from the US Census and that being developed by Excensus' I-Block methodology.)</i>  <i>See the attached Suggested methodology</i>	TBD Subject Matter Experts / Staff Coordinator  (Suggestion: Will Craig (CURA) and/or Twin Cities Research for US Census part and Excensus for their applicability)	Yes	Spring 03
Parcels Information Need – remaining tasks/issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ process for data anomaly feedback to counties</li> </ul>	<b>Dave Brandt</b> (Washington Co.), Curt Peterson, (Ramsey Co.), Gary Swenson (Anoka Co.), Gordon Chinander (Carver Co.), Bob Moulder (Hennepin Co.), Kent Tupper (Dakota Co.), <i>invited</i> (Scott County) and Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council)	Exists	Jan 03 - .
Regional Existing Land Use Information Need Peer Review Forum <i>See the attached Suggested methodology</i>	<b>Paul Hanson</b> (Metropolitan Council), Randall Johnson (MetroGIS)	Yes	Winter 03
Parcels Information Need – remaining tasks/issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ plan for address issues (many to one relationships when a single tax parcel for residential and non-residential – apartments, mobile home parks, strip centers, office parks)</li> </ul>	<b>TBD</b>  <i>(Assumed to have some relationship to household data collected for Excensus I-Blocks)</i>	TBD	Follow / coordinate with work on socioeconomic information need
Regional Highways/Roads/Transportation Networks Information Need (next steps following Peer Review Forum)	<b>Mike Dolbow</b> (Metropolitan Council) and Jim Maxwell (TLG) The Team is being formed and is expected to include other Metropolitan Council and MnDOT staff.	Forum Team will need to expand following 10/24 forum	Nov 02-?
Watershed District Boundaries Information Need	Washington County is working on this issue.	TBD	??

### Enhance Access to Shared Data

Task	Who is Working on This? (Lead TAT Member (if any) in Bold) Other workgroup members do not have to be part of TAT	Work Group Status	Start/End
Expand DataFinder Café to support GML as part of cooperative project with the State	<b>Alison Slaats</b> (DataFinder Manager)	TBD	Jan 03 - TBD 03
Expand DataFinder Café to add a projection conversion function to the download wizard as part of cooperative project with the State or on own if resources available	<b>Alison Slaats</b> (DataFinder Manager)	TBD	Jan 03 - TBD 03
Host Web Mapping Service Forum and pursue 1 on 1 outreach ( <i>Purpose is to expand the number of organizations supporting remotely accessible data via DataFinder</i> )	<b>Alison Slaats</b> (DataFinder Manager)	TBD	Ongoing outreach Forum - Fall 03
Continue to promote use of standardized metadata and common tools for distribution of data	<b>Mark Kotz</b> (Met. Council), Chris Cialek, Susanne Maeder and Nancy Rader (LMIC)	Exists	Ongoing

### Customer Needs and Satisfaction

Task	Who is Working on This? (Lead TAT Member (if any) in Bold)	Work Group Status	Start/End
Monitor satisfaction (forum and survey) of stakeholders use of DataFinder to distribute geodata for their individual organizations and evaluation options to enhance usage.	MetroGIS Technical Support Team ( <b>Johnson</b> , Fester, Slaats)	Exists	Ongoing Forum – Fall 03
Review data received from performance measures as they pertain to data and data distribution	<b>Randy Johnson</b> (MetroGIS), Business Planning Consultant	None Needed	Ongoing
Assist the County Producer Workgroup with investigating the role of MetroGIS concerning the development of geodata applications that address common business needs that are dependent upon MetroGIS's endorsed regional datasets	<b>Policy guidance (initially) from County Producer Workgroup.</b> ( <i>This is an identified Key MetroGIS Challenge Area in the 2003-2005 MetroGIS Business Plan</i> )  Staffed by Business Planning Consultant Team, Staff Coordinator and TAT Lead Support	TBD	Nov 02 - ??
Host Data Users Forum – Parcels (public/academic version)	Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) Mark Kotz – regional custodian rep.	Will need eventually	Spring 03
Host Data Users Forum – Street Centerlines	Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) Mark Kotz – regional custodian rep.	Will need eventually	Fall 03

## **General Expectations and Responsibilities for TAT Work Program Categories**

### **1) Solutions to Priority Common Information Needs**

- Information Needs Workgroup Process – Oversee process to define desired regional data specifications, identify candidate data custodians, and define custodian responsibilities for each priority information needs. See Table below for related 2003 activities.
- Redefinition of Priority Information Needs Project - Participate in the redefinition of priority information needs identified as part of the Business Plan Update and recommend the next priority information needs to be addressed by MetroGIS.
- Data Standards -- Recommend solutions to data standards needs necessary to enhance the effectiveness of data sharing.
- Regularly report progress -- Keep the Coordinating Committee apprised of progress made to address priority information needs.

### **What is expected of an Information Needs Workgroup?**

Each information need is addressed through a replicable process. In general, the process begins by assembling a small **workgroup** of content experts. They will then attempt to identify one or more datasets required to meet the information need. In some cases, this process takes place in a formal Peer Review Forum with more content experts and users. In other cases it is not such a formalized process because the dataset(s) that meet the information need are intuitively recognized.

Once the dataset(s) required to meet an information need is identified, the **workgroup** will need to:

- Refine the desired specifications identified via a Peer Review Forum,
- Identify desired data standards and guidelines,
- Identify desired roles and responsibilities for the custodian organization(s) - organizations responsible for data creation, maintenance, documentation, and distribution; and,
- Identify candidate custodial organizations that have a business need and appropriate expertise to carry out the desired roles and responsibilities.

The workgroup then makes recommendations to the TAT and the Coordinating Committee. The process is complete when the Policy Board has adopted, as policy for the MetroGIS community, parameters (data specifications, standards, etc.) defined by the workgroup. The parameters are posted on the MetroGIS website for each "MetroGIS endorsed regional dataset". Once an endorsed dataset is operational, MetroGIS monitors user satisfaction to continually enhance it.

### **2) Enhance Access to Shared Data (*DataFinder - Data Search and Distribution Mechanism*)**

- Facilitate collaboration: – Recommend and provide guidance concerning development of applications and scripts; telecommunication and related solutions for security issues; institutional solutions needed to improve online access to shared data.
  - Communication options
  - Resources
  - Group Purchases
  - Identify Security Issues – Best Practices
  - Integrate Web Mapping Service Technology With Technology to Provide Access to Source Data
- Metadata Enhancements – Monitor and provide guidance concerning development of metadata for core regional data and posting it with DataFinder.
  - Monitor usage
  - Integrate Legacy Datasets
  - Integrate into Job Position Descriptions and Everyday Use
  - Enhance Geographic Search Capabilities (e.g., 2001-02 NSDI Web Mapping Service Grant Project)
  - Provide FTP Download Capabilities

- Promote use of metadata guidelines
- Promote increased diversity of organizations posting metadata on DataFinder and increased number of the metadata records
- Coordinate with Minnesota's GeoGateway -- Maintain coordination links, as necessary, to ensure coordination of design and procedural matters between Minnesota's GeoGateway and MetroGIS DataFinder.
  - Coordination Links
  - Monitor technical developments that impact NSDI Clearinghouse activities and DataFinder efforts.

### 3) **Customer Needs and Satisfaction**

- Regional Data Policy: Co-host data users forums with regional custodians and oversee recommendations to enhance endorsed datasets.
- Regional Data Distribution Policy (DataFinder): Assist staff and the Coordinating Committee in defining and monitoring performance measures to periodically evaluate who is using DataFinder, what data are being accessed, user satisfaction with the functionality provided, and recommend enhancements as needed.
- Information Sharing: Provide a forum to share uses of geographic information technology that improve efficiency and effectiveness of organizations that comprise the MetroGIS community.

### 4) **Privacy Issues Relating to Access**

*(Note: These activities are generally incorporated into the Team's recommended solutions for each priority common information needs – Section 1.)*

Identify issues relating to distribution of sensitive data of regional significance and recommend widely acceptable guidelines, in particular universal data summary/aggregation units, to address issues relating, but not limited to:

- Sensitive Data
- Definition of Public Data
- Responsibility of Data Security
- Data Practices Act

### 5) **Coordinate with the Governor's Council on Geographic Information (GCGI)**

**Responsibility:** Monitor activity of the GCGI and others, as appropriate, and seek participation and coordination in work of others relevant to MetroGIS.

**Tasks:** (not covered by Coordinating Committee)

- GCGI Standards Committee (MetroGIS Technical Support Staff)
- GCGI Hydrographic Committee (MetroGIS Technical Support Staff)

### 6) **Other:** As defined by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

## Suggested Methodologies

### Supplement to 2003 Coordinating Committee and Technical Advisory Team Work Plans

#### 1. (Phase B) Socioeconomic Characteristics of Areas Information Need

##### A) U.S. Census Workgroup:

- (1) This group would carry out the following tasks:
  - Extract the "I need to know" statements from the 1996 Business Information Needs Forum group exercise
  - Prepare an initial evaluation of how the MetroGIS community's information needs compare and contrast the data provided by the U.S. Census to the cited information needs – *Do the data exist? Is its currency, resolution, etc. adequate?*
  - Host a Peer Review Forum with 20-30 expert users of the Census data from the MetroGIS community and ask them to "update" the information needs cited in 1996 and expand upon the initial compare and contrast work of the smaller workgroup
  - Consolidate the information obtained at the Peer Review Forum and recommend a course of action -- how U.S. Census data should be used to address the community's census data related information needs, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.
- (2) The individuals who served as members of the Census Accessibility Workgroup are suggested as the core participants for the leadership/Peer Forum organization group.

##### B) Excensus Workgroup:

- (1) This group would carry out the following tasks:
  - Review the work of the U.S. Census Workgroup
  - Host a Peer Review Forum to discuss how the Excensus protocol could fill gaps in the information needs not met by the U.S. Census.
  - Consolidate the information obtained at the Peer Review Forum and recommend a course of action -- how could Excensus's be used in conjunction with U.S. Census data to address the community's census data related information needs, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.
- (2) Individuals highly knowledgeable of Excensus's protocols and the U.S. Census, as well as, MetroGIS stakeholders would comprise leadership/Peer Forum organization group.

#### 2. Existing Land Use Information Need

- A) Establish a workgroup comprised of respected content experts from cities, counties, and regional interests and preferably work in concert with I-35W Coalition or similar entity to pilot decision rules for developing the regional solution.
- B) This work group would carry out the following tasks:
  - Extract the "I need to know" statements from the 1996 Business Information Needs Forum group exercise
  - Host a Peer Review Forum with 20-30 expert users of the Existing Land Use data from the MetroGIS community and ask them to "update" the information needs cited in 1996.
  - Prepare an initial evaluation of how the MetroGIS community's information needs compare and contrast the Metropolitan Council's 2000 Existing Land Use dataset. *Is its currency, resolution, categorization of land uses, etc. adequate for subregional users?*
  - Propose a set of decision rules that address any shortcomings of the Council's 2000 Existing Land Use dataset and how to resolve instances where all or a portion of a parcel of land that appears to be undeveloped and available is in fact encumbered (recorded easement, City approved PUD, etc.) and not available for development.
  - Recommend a mechanism to capture and relate recorded documents, PUD's, TDR's, scenic easements, etc. to parcels which are not but appear not to be developable.
  - Pilot a solution that is consistent with the community's needs and recommend a course of action to achieve the desired the data characteristics, roles and responsibilities, and custodian responsibilities.