

MetroGIS Technical Leadership Steering Workgroup
February 28, 2008
Meeting Notes

General Notes

- Kotz – There should be two components to Coordinating Committee report: 1. Here’s what PlanGraphics said; 2. Here’s our response (also include brief summary of survey results); 3. Emphasis should be on workgroup’s input
- Give CC executive summary of observations/recommendations, survey summary, Workgroup’s response
- Bitner – PlanGraphics Report needs to be more clear that this was “prepared for” MetroGIS (wipe from master slide)
- Read – May be able to get administrative help in-house to reformat PlanGraphics report
- MetroGIS needs to be a more “structured container”
- Very important to communicate the value of MetroGIS to participant organizations
- Organizational structure impacts the way in which we relate to one another
- We need to have a recommendation at March CC meeting on what changes need to be made to 2008 budget
- What do we need to ask for in the 2009 budgeting process????
- CC report should address at least the qualitative return on investment, if not quantitative

Information for the Coordinating Committee Report/Matrix

Observation/Recommendations – Section 1

- Workgroup concurs that there needs an additional MetroGIS staffer to handle coordination and facilitation of technical issues, opportunities and resources. “Technical Coordinator” speaks the language, knows the issues, but does not write code, etc. They need to know who to bring to the table to get things done. Benefit: We want to more effectively share applications and services across MetroGIS, and this position makes that possible.

Observation/Recommendations – Section 2

- Observation #2 is consistent with current business practices and activities and Board direction
- Workgroup observation: We need multi-nodal systems to increase reliability and redundancy, especially if/when MetroGIS becomes more involved in emergency preparedness/emergency response

Observation/Recommendations – Section 3

- Additional formality: When I use this service from this provider, what expectations can I have?
- MetroGIS could provide a template for a service level agreement, similar to what we have for metadata expectations
- MetroGIS, even under current structure, could help participant organizations set up service level agreements

Observation/Recommendations – Section 4

- Workgroup generally concurs with observation
- Recommendation 4.1 – Workgroup considers Collaborative Portal to be low priority because it is passive
 - Mailing list or something similar could potentially serve our needs in the short term
- Second paragraph of Recommendation 4.1 notes – Marketplace
 - Policy Board has been reluctant to embrace anything that resembles “advertising”
 - This is well beyond the scope of MetroGIS, and also may be difficult to accomplish, especially within a governmental context
- Recommendation 4.4 – Again, a mailing list may accomplish what we need (perhaps through Technical Advisory Team list).
 - Other benefits: Low overhead. TAT reaches out to new people.

Observation/Recommendations – Section 5

- This meshes with Business Plan on showcasing MetroGIS. How to let people know we exist, benefits of participation, etc. It is consistent with the Business Plan, Outreach Plan, etc. However, it is beyond the scope of this Workgroup.
 - Workgroup recommendation: CC should consider a Workgroup to consider these recommendations
 - Expand testimonials?
- Recommendation 5.4 – Pass on to future Outreach Workgroup

Observation/Recommendations – Section 6

- Recommendation 6.1 – Not within scope of workgroup
- 6.3 – Low priority

Observation/Recommendations – Section 7

- 7.1 – This is a good idea, but there needs to be a process to do this (created by MetroGIS)
- 7.1 – We need to have a big session like we did on data

- 7.2 – Address this once 7.1 has been determined

Observation/Recommendations – Section 8

- 8.1 – Priority. We should find some situations in which to do this (define an authentication protocol for Geocoder, etc). In the short term, this recommendation would likely be carried out with a series of pilots.
- 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 – Kotz says these are not clearly in our scope

Observation/Recommendations – Section 9

- 9.1 – King County example may not apply because MetroGIS is not a self-contained unit of government
- 9.3 – Challenge grants (“matching”). We’re basically already doing this.
- 9.4 and 9.5 – Should not be an assumption of Met Council funding

General comment: There is a general assumption throughout the PlanGraphics report that any new funding will come from the Met Council. We need to make sure this is not assumed.

Set next meeting date – Wednesday, March 12 at 9:00am – Noon, probably at Mosquito Control (between now and then, Randy and I will share preliminary draft with Nancy and Mark)