

## NOTES FOR MARCH 14, 2007 MEETING OF

Business Planning Oversight Team  
Offices of RRA

### **A. What did we hear at the Feb 8<sup>th</sup> Workshop**

- Need to be action oriented. 1-2 years to implement solutions to shared needs is a concern. How to be more responsive to new and previously defined shared needs?
- What does it mean to solve real world problems? (as defined by policy makers?) Need to define boundaries for MetroGIS's role versus roles of stakeholders. (Editor's note: during a subsequent meeting with Professor Bryson's assistance, MetroGIS's general role was acknowledged to be that of a capacity builder; a concept/label which then became prominent in the next generation policy platform.)

### **B. Cross-Cutting Policy -& Strategy Components for the Next Generation Plan**

General conclusions reached by the Team were as follows: (*excerpt from Report to Coordinating Committee at March 2007 Meeting in lieu of a separate meeting summary*)

- 1) The **direction** received during the workshop concerning several **key cross-cutting policy issues** is sufficient **to move forward**. These issues are listed in the order that the Oversight Team believes is most to least critical:
  - Information Needs – *Direction Received*: Broaden the current scoping policy of pursuing only those needs which are common to the core stakeholder community to also encourage efforts involving collaborative solutions to needs that are critical to a significant contingent of MetroGIS's participants.
  - Geographic Reach – *Direction Received*: - Purpose statement developed and agreed upon by the workgroup members on March 14 was as follows: members: "*The geographic scope of MetroGIS extends beyond the seven-county metropolitan region, as needed (case by case), to address issues and provide or enhance services important to its members*". The workshop concluded that addressing project needs that extend beyond the Metro Area need not involve changes in MetroGIS's governance.
  - Critical Infrastructure – *Direction Received*: Investigate how best to interface with/promote Information Systems infrastructure important to MetroGIS's ability to achieve its goals but beyond the scope of GIS technology
  - Stakeholders, Participants, and Partners – *Direction Received*: There is a need to establish terminology, whether using these or other words, which clearly communicates those who contribute to and benefit from MetroGIS's efforts as well as clearly define expectations for participation. The key is to be clear on expectations for support roles and other means of contributing to MetroGIS's efforts; as such, the Oversight Team believes this definitional need is best addressed as a component of defining strategies to achieve priority needs and not as a separate exercise - form to follow function.
- 2) The **priority outcomes and activities** (strategies) as **established at the Workshop** (above) should **drive the Business Plan Update** process. Stated another way, the Oversight Team does not believe a survey of the broad community is necessary to set priorities, given the breadth of perspectives involved in the Strategic Directions Workshop exercises, including both policy makers and managers, and the maturity of MetroGIS's philosophies since the survey of stakeholders was administered in 1999 to establish MetroGIS's initial priority functions. The Oversight Team members did, however, concur that a survey could be useful later in the process as we get further into projects concerning updating of information needs and/or identifying real world problems facing participants.
- 3) A **workgroup-based process methodology**, similar to that used the past, should be utilized to evaluate options and formulate recommendations for desired courses of action to address priority needs.

Prepared by  
Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator