



MetroGIS Work Plan: 2013

MetroGIS
390 Robert Street North
St Paul, Minnesota 55101
www.metrogis.org

Approved by MetroGIS Coordinating Committee:
Modified by MetroGIS Coordinating Committee:

March 21, 2013
June 20, 2013

MetroGIS Work Plan: 2013

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
What is MetroGIS?.....	4
Accomplishments: 2008-2012	5-6
Maintenance Activities	7
Project Prioritization Brief.....	8
Projects for 2013.....	9-16
Re-Design and Re-Launch metrogis.org.....	9
Support for the Centerline Initiative.....	10
Support for the Geospatial Commons	11
Develop Collaborative Tools	12
Improve Address Point Editing Tools.....	13
Address Points Dataset	14
Develop and Implement a Leadership Succession Plan.....	15
Remaining Project List	16
2013 Budget.....	17
Appendix A: Project Prioritization Methodology	18-20

Contact

Questions about this document can be directed to:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
390 Robert Street North, St Paul, Minnesota 55101
geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us
651.602.1638

Introduction

This Work Plan document provides a summary of the projects and activities to be undertaken in calendar 2013 and is intended to be a living document subject to change at the suggestion of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee.

Annual Revision

The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee will formally revisit and edit the Work Plan once per year (generally the December Committee meeting) to chart the progress of existing projects and include new projects which rise in priority or interest. Formal revisions to the Work Plan will be used to direct the annual MetroGIS budget.

Mid Year Adjustments

Revisions and modifications to this Work Plan can be suggested by any member of the Coordinating Committee and be approved by vote at any quarterly meeting using this process:

- (1) Complete the one-page project descriptions sheet used in this work plan
- (2) If a willing project owner is identified, a Coordinating Committee member may propose the project at the next quarterly meeting. The Committee may decide to
 - a. Postpone the project until the next annual planning cycle, or
 - b. Accept the project to be worked on in the current year and prioritize it relative to the other projects schedule for this year.

Revision and re-publication of the Work Plan document is the responsibility of the MetroGIS Coordinator or duly appointed designee. A copy of the currently adopted and approved MetroGIS Work Plan will be made available to the stakeholder community and general public via metrogis.org or upon request to the MetroGIS Coordinator.

2013, Coordinating Committee Members:

David Bitner, Chair, <i>dbSpatial</i>	David Brandt, Vice Chair, <i>Washington County</i>
Melissa Baker, <i>Capitol Region Watershed</i>	William Brown, <i>Hennepin County</i>
Jim Bunning, <i>Scott County</i>	Harold Busch, <i>Metro Cities</i>
Dick Carlstrom, <i>TIES</i>	Ron Wencil, <i>USGS</i>
Adam Fisher, <i>MNCAR</i>	Gordon Chinander, <i>Metro Emerg. Services Board</i>
Rick Gelbmann, <i>Metropolitan Council</i>	Joella Givens, <i>MnDOT</i>
Francis Harvey, <i>University of Minnesota</i>	Brad Henry, <i>University of Minnesota</i>
Peter Henschel, <i>Carver County</i>	Randy Knippel, <i>Dakota County</i>
Matt Koukol, <i>Ramsey County</i>	Tim Loesch, <i>MnDNR</i>
Mark Maloney, <i>City of Shoreview</i>	Jeff Matson, <i>CURA/MN Council of Non-Profits</i>
Dan Ross, <i>State GIO, MnGeo</i>	Nancy Read, <i>Metropolitan Mosquito Control Board</i>
John Slusarczyk, <i>Anoka County</i>	Gary Swenson, <i>Hennepin County</i>
Ben Verbick, <i>LOGIS</i>	Mark Kotz, <i>Metropolitan Council</i>

Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator	Paul Peterson, MetroGIS Project Manager
----------------------------------	---

What is MetroGIS?

MetroGIS is voluntary collaborative that works to serve the needs for geospatial information in the Twin Cities metropolitan region. MetroGIS was formed in 1995 in response to the articulated need for maximizing the benefits of sharing geospatial data in the region.

The goal of MetroGIS is *to expand stakeholders' capacity to address shared geographic information technology needs through a collaboration of organizations that serve the Twin Cities metropolitan area.*

Relying entirely upon voluntary participation, MetroGIS realizes this mission by:

- Identifying and defining shared geospatial information needs;*
- Implementing collaborative regional solutions to address shared needs;*
- Fostering widespread access and sharing of geospatial data;*
- Fostering recognition of the value of GIS as a core business tool;*
- Facilitating knowledge sharing relevant to the advancement of GIS technology;*

Mission Statement

"To 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."

- adopted February 1996

Action Areas

MetroGIS's actions are categorized into the following areas that are intended to align with desired outcomes.

- Develop and maintain regional data solutions to address shared information needs;*
- Facilitate and continue to improve data sharing;*
- Promote a forum for knowledge sharing;*
- Build advocacy and awareness;*
- Expand the MetroGIS stakeholder group;*
- Maintain funding policies for highest possible system-wide benefit;*
- Optimize MetroGIS governance and organizational structure to serve its goals;*

Sponsorship Statement

The work of MetroGIS is made possible and strengthened by the range of resources offered by its stakeholder community. Since its inception in 1995, the Metropolitan Council has provided the financial resources and administrative oversight to the collaborative, while other agencies, organizations and jurisdictions provide data, research, expertise, guidance and governance. This blend of diverse resources is vital to the continuance of MetroGIS's ability to represent and serve the broad geospatial stakeholder community of the Twin Cities metropolitan region.

Accomplishments: 2008-2012

The last Work Plan cycle for MetroGIS was from 2008 through 2012. The following activities from those five years represent the key successes of the collaborative in serving the geospatial community of the metropolitan area.

Regional Parcel Dataset

The Regional Parcel Dataset is the flagship offering of MetroGIS. In February 2012, MetroGIS renewed the Regional Parcel Data legal agreements with the seven-metropolitan counties through 2016. Maintenance and distribution of the Regional Parcel Dataset has continued, with expansion to 134 registered users of the dataset as of December 21, 2012.

Datafinder.org

MetroGIS continues to support, maintain and update the DataFinder website. As of December 21, 2012 there are 279 datasets available from www.datafinder.org.

NCompass Centerline Data

In 2011, MetroGIS facilitated the renewal of the contract between the Metropolitan Council and private data vendor NCompass. This agreement provides access to the NCompass Street Centerline and Landmarks data, at no fee, to all State and Local Government agencies as well as all colleges and universities in Minnesota. The Metropolitan Council has funded the licensing of these data for use by these organizations to promote standardization and sharing of geographic information.

Data Improvement Plan

In December 2010, MetroGIS contracted with Applied Geographics to perform a needs assessment workshop and survey to gather and report information on unmet stakeholder geospatial data needs. The final report, published in December 2011, provided key insights that informed the contents of this plan.

Regional Address Points Dataset and Web Editor Tool

Development of an Address Points Dataset has been continuous throughout the last Work Plan period with rapid project growth in 2011 and 2012. Most recently, MetroGIS retained a private vendor to develop a web editing tool; which as of December 2012 is 90% complete. Several metro counties are testing the tool for potential deployment. The Address Point Workgroup has worked to define and prioritize enhancements for the next version of the web-based editor tool.

New Street Centerlines Maintenance Model

With the growing recognition that existing centerline dataset solutions may not be meeting the long-term needs of its diverse users, MetroGIS has been working in partnership with MnDOT and MnGeo on examining the potential for a new sustainable centerline solution.

MetroGIS hired Applied Geographics to facilitate a one-day centerline stakeholder workshop and provide a supplemental analysis report in 2011. The session was intended to solicit input and perform needs assessment for a future centerline solution. June of 2012 saw the formation of the Centerline Steering Committee, to guide the project process. MetroGIS again hired Applied Geographics and in partnership with MnDOT and MnGeo to facilitate a two-day workshop and engagement session in October 2012 with stakeholders from both the metropolitan counties and Greater Minnesota.

MetroGIS, in partnership with MnDOT and MnGeo facilitated a half-day technical centerline session in December 2012 to shape the core attribution needs of the stakeholder groups, understand existing use cases and data needs at the city, county and regional level. Follow up by the leadership team of the Centerline Steering Committee met in January 2013 has been used to assign project managers from participating agencies and shape the pilot study.

Findings from these sessions form the core assumptions and points of beginning for the Centerline Pilot Project scheduled for 2013.

GECCo (Geospatially Enabling Community Collaboration) Session

MetroGIS helped fund and participated in the Twin Cities GECCo in October 2011. The event, co-sponsored by the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Geospatial Information and Technology Association (GITA), focused on emergency management and infrastructure protection from the geospatial data sharing perspective. The goal was to identify the interdependencies of critical infrastructure and to develop protection and mitigation plans.

Completion of the Quantifying Public Value Study, 2011

MetroGIS working in partnership with the University of Minnesota, non-profit Envision Minnesota and the Metropolitan Council to conduct and publish a study on the public value of geospatial data sharing. The study was funded by a \$50,000 NSDI CAP Grant in 2010. The final study was completed and published in January 2012.

MetroGIS Website Re-conceptualization

In 2012, the MetroGIS Communications Work Team developed a series of design and function specifications for transitioning the existing MetroGIS website to a new design. The new site will be a more graphically inviting and robust resource for the stakeholder community and general public seeking data, standards and information on MetroGIS.

Stormsewer Data Standard Development and Pilot Project

MetroGIS, in partnership with MnGeo, was involved in the development of a draft Stormsewer Data Standard and funded a sub-watershed data collection and analysis pilot project in 2010. The draft standard progress and completed pilot project set the stage for future work in the stormsewer data development arena.

Maintenance Activities

MetroGIS assumes a core maintenance role for a variety of activities that serve the geospatial community of the metropolitan region. These actions collectively work to satisfy the Action Areas (listed on Page 4 of the Work Plan).

(1) Regional Parcel Dataset

MetroGIS provides on-going custodial support and maintenance for the Regional Parcel Dataset. This includes maintenance of legal contracts, review and approval of data access requests and aggregation and distribution of data via the MetroGIS ftp site.

(2) DataFinder.org

MetroGIS provides continual updates, maintenance and hosting of the Datafinder.org data clearinghouse resource.

(3) Metrogis.org website

MetroGIS maintains the 'metrogis.org' website as a resource for a variety of audiences including MetroGIS stakeholders, governance participants, and researchers looking for data, standards and related information.

(4) MetroGIS Governance

MetroGIS maintains three permanent governance bodies, the Policy Board (comprised of elected county commissioners and administrative-level decision makers), the Coordinating Committee (comprised of management-level professionals) and the Technical Advisory Team. MetroGIS makes use of smaller-sized, more nimble Work Groups which focus on specific tasks or initiatives and report their findings to the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board. The inter-communication between these groups is an essential part of the MetroGIS collaborative.

(5) Hosting of educational/data sharing forums

MetroGIS is active in promoting and facilitating educational, data sharing and related forums for the geospatial community of Minnesota.

(6) Participation in statewide geospatial initiatives

MetroGIS continues to work collaboratively with all levels of government. Aligning our work plan, initiatives and efforts with complementary initiatives to reduce duplication and maximize benefit are key goals of this Work Plan.

(7) Data Sharing Advocacy and Collaboration Resource

MetroGIS serves as a resource and source of information to the academic community as well as other governments in the operational procedure, funding, management and governance on the topic of inter-agency geospatial data sharing. MetroGIS takes an active interest in the legal and legislative aspects of data development, data sharing and public data availability and supports efforts which facilitate these activities.

Project Prioritization Brief

As a volunteer collaborative with limited fiscal and human resources, MetroGIS needs to be judicious when selecting which projects it will proceed with. The table of projects below has been collected from the prior MetroGIS Business Plan (2008-2011), from discussion and needs arising from the Coordinating Committee and is inclusive of initiatives already underway.

Projects were prioritized by the Coordinating Committee based on several factors including stakeholder business needs, MetroGIS's mission, likelihood of success and availability of funding. A more detailed description of the prioritization method is available in Appendix A.

Projects in **blue** are considered internal to MetroGIS for the continued function and operation of the collaborative. Projects in **orange** are projects that have a direct benefit to the external stakeholder group and will produce data, data standards or other services. This color scheme is persistent through the entire Work Plan document.

MetroGIS Project/Initiative	Work in 2013	Committee Ranking	Priority Score
Re-launch metrogis.org	Yes	1	320
Support the Centerlines Initiative	Yes	2	310
Support Geospatial Commons	Yes	3	280
Deploy Collaborative Tools	Yes	4	280
Improve Address Point Editing Tool	Yes	5	275
Develop Address Points Dataset	Yes	6	256
Implement Leadership Succession Update Operating Guidelines	Yes	7	224
Complete Communications Plan	No	8	310
Develop Performance Metrics	No	9	125
Facilitate a Data Exchange Between Counties & Commercial Real Estate	No	10	68
Increase Frequency of Parcel Data Updates	No	11	57
Create Regional Base Map Service	No	12	52
Fund & Support " Follow On " QPV	No	13	42

MetroGIS Projects for 2013

The following pages provide a one-page synopsis of each MetroGIS 2013 project. A short summary of the non-2013 projects discussed or planned for future work plans is also provided.

Re-Design and Re-Launch metrogis.org

Project Brief	MetroGIS's existing website, logo and brand identity are to be updated. A new website is needed that serves the variety of audiences and is a useful communication and access tool. The existing site has a wealth of excellent information but lacks ease of use and graphic appeal.
Critical Stakeholders	Entire MetroGIS Community
Value or Stakeholder Business Needs Met	The website will serve as a core information and communications resource for the entire MetroGIS Community
Priority Level	1st, Top Priority, Complete in 2013
Budget:	\$25,000 (2013), \$25,000 (Carried from 2012)
Project Owner	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team:	MetroGIS Communications Workgroup
Expected Timeline:	Vendor under contract in Summer 2013 Target launch date: October 1, 2013 Full deployment of new site in Fall/Winter 2013
Key Steps Milestones	Develop new interface navigation categories (complete) Develop draft wireframe design (complete) Revision/Packaging/Archiving of existing content (in progress) Request for Proposals Testing of Draft Revisions and Final Deployment
Policy Implications:	N/A
MetroGIS Action Area(s)	<i>Build Advocacy and Awareness</i> <i>Expand MetroGIS Stakeholder Group</i> <i>Promote a Forum for Knowledge Sharing</i> <i>Optimize MetroGIS Organization</i>

MetroGIS Support for the Centerlines Initiative

Project Brief	The Centerlines Initiative is the development of a public-domain street centerline network to meet a variety of state, regional, county and municipal needs. MetroGIS began the work of developing a solution for the metropolitan counties. As parallel projects at the state agency level have emerged, this provides an opportunity for a larger collaborative effort.
Critical Stakeholders	All government agencies and departments using street centerline data
Value or Stakeholder Business Need Met	Availability of accurate, up-to-date, routable, fully attributed road centerline data is a core state data infrastructure need and will be utilized by local, county, state, regional and federal entities.
Priority Level	2nd Priority, Work Continues Through 2013
Budget:	(Funds re-apportioned to the Address Points Projects)
Project Owner(s)	Dan Ross, State GIO
Project Champion(s)	Dan Ross, State GIO, MnGeo
Project Team:	Centerline Steering Committee
Expected Timeline:	Core Attribution Survey dispersal and results (February 2013) Pilot Project begun (Spring 2013)
Key Steps Milestones	Core Attribution Survey Results (February 2013) Pilot Project (2013)
Policy Implications	Likely
MetroGIS Action Area(s)	<i>Regional Data Solutions to Identified Shared Needs Facilitate and Improve Data Sharing Maintain Funding Policies for Highest Possible System-wide Benefit</i>

MetroGIS Support for the Geospatial Commons

Project Brief	The MN Geospatial Commons is intended to be a single web location where we all find and share our geospatial resources to make us a stronger, more productive and more effective geospatial community and to increase that capacity of each participant. The State will own this project and MetroGIS will be a participant.
Critical Stakeholders	MnGeo, Entire MetroGIS Community Spatial data users in the State of Minnesota
Value or Stakeholder Business Need Met	We expect the Commons to replace DataFinder eventually. This will eliminate the need to upgrade DataFinder. Many organizations have a need for more data and to have that data automatically updated locally. The Commons will help to meet this need.
Priority Level	3rd Priority, Work Continues Through 2013
Budget:	No funding needed
Project Owner(s)	MnGeo
Project Champion(s)	Dan Ross, State GIO, MnGeo Carolyn Parnell, MN CIO
Project Team:	Geospatial Commons Workgroup
Expected Timeline	(X)
Key Steps Milestones	(X)
Policy Implications	Data access and security policies may be needed. There may also be policies related to participation at the state level.
MetroGIS Action Area(s)	<i>Facilitate and Improve Data Sharing Promote a forum for Knowledge Sharing Maintain Funding Policies for Highest Possible System-wide Benefit Build Advocacy and Awareness Optimize MetroGIS Organization</i>

Develop Collaborative Tools

Project Brief	Find and make available a suite of tools for on-line collaboration, document sharing and project collaboration.
Critical Stakeholders	Entire MetroGIS Community
Value or Stakeholder Business Needs Met	This will facilitate easier knowledge transfer and collaborative work among the MetroGIS stakeholder community and work groups. It will also allow enable virtual meeting capabilities, eliminating some travel time and costs.
Priority Level	4th Priority: Complete in 2013
Budget:	\$2,000 allotted from annual budget
Project Owner:	Paul Peterson, MetroGIS Project Manager Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	MetroGIS Communications Workgroup
Expected Timeline	Continued assessment/trial of solutions through 2013
Key Steps Milestones	Purchase a GoToMeeting account for MetroGIS Test a variety document sharing/editing solutions through 2013
Policy Implications:	N/A
MetroGIS Action Area(s)	<i>Expand MetroGIS Stakeholder Group Promote a Forum for Knowledge Sharing Optimize MetroGIS Organization</i>

Improve Address Point Editing Tool

Project Brief	The first version of the web editing tool was developed in 2012. It will be hosted by counties to allow cities to maintain address points. Budget limitations prevented contracting for all desired functionality in the first version of the tool. This project involves contracting with a vendor to implement functional enhancements.
Critical Stakeholders	County Governments City Governments Emergency Response/911 Community
Value or Stakeholder Business Need Met	Several counties have defined a business need to have such an application to facilitate address points data collection and maintenance with their cities. (see ' Address Points Dataset ' on next page)
Priority Level	5th Priority, Work Continues Through 2013
Budget:	\$28,700 (Includes Address Points Dataset) Includes funds reappropriated from Centerlines Initiative (6/20/13)
Project Owner(s)	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Project Champion(s)	(N/A)
Project Team:	Address Editing Tool Workgroup
Expected Timeline	Enhancements implemented by Fall 2013
Key Steps Milestones	Version 1.0 completed by February 2012 Version 2.0 available for testing in Fall 2013
Policy Implications:	<i>None</i>
MetroGIS Action Area(s)	<i>Regional Data Solutions to Identified Shared Needs Facilitate and Improve Data Sharing Maintain Funding Policies for Highest Possible System-wide Benefit</i>

Address Points Dataset

Project Brief	To work with stakeholders to develop a sustainable, regional address points dataset to meet a variety of stakeholder needs, in particular for Next Generation 9-1-1.
Critical Stakeholders	County Governments City Governments Emergency Response/911 Community
Value or Stakeholder Business Need Met	PSAPs will have more accurate and current data with which to dispatch and route emergency vehicles. Cities will be able to track individual units for planning and other purposes and will be able to create mailing labels to individual units/residences, not just to parcels. Metropolitan Council will have better growth monitoring data. Many stakeholders will have access to more accurate geocoding services.
Priority Level	6th Priority, Work Continue Through 2013
Budget:	\$28,700 (Includes Address Points Editor Tool) Includes funds reappropriated from Centerlines Initiative (6/20/13)
Project Owner(s)	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Project Champion(s)	None
Project Team	Address Workgroup
Expected Timeline	Work to continue into 2014 and probably beyond for data development, ongoing for data maintenance, aggregation and distribution of regional solution.
Key Steps Milestones	Implementation of version 1 of editing tool in multiple counties (2013). Define and implement aggregation strategy for regional dataset (2013).
Policy Implications	Data distribution policy, possible agreements between cities and counties
MetroGIS Action Area(s):	<i>Regional Data Solutions to Identified Shared Needs Facilitate and Improve Data Sharing Maintain Funding Policies for Highest Possible System-wide Benefit</i>

Develop and Implement a Leadership Succession Plan

Project Brief	MetroGIS current Operational Guidelines lack formal language directing the approval of new members on to the Coordinating Committee and the Policy Board. With the imminent restructuring of the Policy Board and the vacancy of numerous seats on the Coordinating Committee, review and revisions of MetroGIS' Operational Procedures to meet current needs is warranted.
Critical Stakeholders	Entire MetroGIS Community
Value or Stakeholder Business Needs Met	This will provide a consistent and more efficient process for filling vacant seats. Revision of governance of MetroGIS provides clarity and transparency to our processes.
Priority Level	7th Priority: Complete in 2013
Budget:	No funding needed
Project Owner	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	MetroGIS Coordinating Committee will serve as the body for review and for approval
Expected Timeline:	Completion of first draft (March 2013) Revision and submittal of second draft in (June 2013)
Key Steps Milestones	Completion and approval of revised Operational Guidelines for review and approval of the Coordinating Committee in 2013
Policy Implications	Governance revisions will need final approval of Coordinating Committee and Policy Board
MetroGIS Action Area(s):	<i>Expand MetroGIS Stakeholder Group</i> <i>Optimize MetroGIS Organization</i>

Remaining Project List

The following projects did not meet the requisite criteria for inclusion in active Work Plan projects in calendar 2013. These projects will be revisited in December 2013 for potential inclusion in 2014 Work Plan.

Remaining Projects	Brief Description
Completion of a MetroGIS Communications Plan	<i>This will be revisited once the new MetroGIS website is completed, tested, approved and deployed.</i>
Completion of Stormwater Data Standard and Dataset	<i>Stakeholder communities are in the process of identifying their business need and support for the completion of the project and are providing letters of interest/support; these will be used to leverage political and financial backing in the future of the project.</i> <i>MetroGIS Coordinator is in discussion with self-identifying agencies, organizations and jurisdictions as to their level interest and what resources they can commit.</i>
Facilitation of data exchange between private real estate interests and metro counties (Private/Public Data Sharing Partnership)	<i>MetroGIS is an appropriate venue for fostering discussion, however, MetroGIS is likely not nimble or well resourced enough to fully facilitate the counties and the real estate industry at the level needed for successful back-end data exchange.</i>
Development of MetroGIS Performance Metrics	<i>Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority; does not meet an existing stakeholder need</i>
Increase frequency of parcel data updates	<i>Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority; does not meet an existing stakeholder need</i>
Development of Regional Base Map Services	<i>Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority; does not meet an existing stakeholder need</i>
Fund and Support 'Follow On' for QPV (Quantifying Public Value) study	<i>Existing study serves present purposes of describing public value; a follow on study was not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority; project does not meet an existing stakeholder need</i>

MetroGIS 2013 Budget

Project	Funding Amount	Project Lead(s)	Project Team or Review Body
Re-Launch MetroGIS Website	\$25,000.00*	Geoff Maas	Communications Workgroup
MetroGIS Participation in the Centerline Initiative	Funding transferred To Address Points Editor (6/20/13)	Dan Ross (MnGeo) Paul Peterson Geoff Maas	Centerline Steering Committee
MetroGIS Participation in the Geospatial Commons	<i>(Funding not necessary)</i>	Mark Kotz Dan Ross (MnGeo)	Geospatial Commons Workgroup
Deployment of On-Line Collaborative Tools	\$2,000.00	Paul Peterson	Communications Workgroup
Improve Address Point Editing Tool	\$28,700.00 <i>(Vendor services)</i>	Mark Kotz	Address Work Group
Develop Address Points Dataset	<i>(Linked to Editing Tool funding)</i>	Mark Kotz	Address Work Group
Implement Leadership Succession Plan / Revision of Operational Guidelines	<i>(Funding not necessary)</i>	Geoff Maas	MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
Annual Contract Payments to Metropolitan Counties for Parcel Data	\$28,000.00	Geoff Maas Mark Kotz	Metropolitan County GIS Managers
Web Domain Registrations, Printing, Miscellaneous & Discretionary Funds	\$2,300.00	Geoff Maas	MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
TOTALS	\$86,000.00		

*It is anticipated that up to \$50,000 will be spent on the new MetroGIS website; \$25,000 of which is committed from the MetroGIS 2013 budget, the remainder will be funded by the Metropolitan Council.

Appendix A: Project Prioritization Methodology

This appendix describes the process used to identify and prioritize MetroGIS Work Plan items. It is designed to assess three important criteria:

- Value of projects to MetroGIS stakeholders
- Likelihood of project success
- Collective wisdom of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

Project Prioritization Steps

1 Create a list of proposed projects

- a. Provide a list of all previously proposed projects to the CC and ask for any additions.
- b. Create a final list of proposed projects.

2 Assess the value of each project (via web survey to CC members) Questions:

- a. For most projects that help stakeholders directly (e.g. address points): **“How great is your organization’s business need for the results of this project?”**
 - i. High
 - ii. Medium
 - iii. Low
 - iv. No business need
- b. For MetroGIS specific items (e.g. update web site): **“For MetroGIS to function effectively, serve its stakeholders and support its mission, how great is MetroGIS’s need to complete this project?”**
 - i. High
 - ii. Medium
 - iii. Low
 - iv. Not needed
- c. A few additional questions will be asked (e.g. your name, are you willing to be project owner? Part of project work team?)

3 Assess likelihood of success of each project

- a. Follow up with involved stakeholders to assess key factors related to likelihood of success
 - i. What is estimated effort to complete project? (person/hour categories)
 - ii. Is funding required? If so, is it available?
 - iii. Does a committed project owner exist?
 - iv. Does a committed project team exist (if needed)?
 - v. Does an active, high-level project champion exist (if needed)?

- 4 **Calculate preliminary priorities** based on results (See spreadsheet)
 - a. Create a magic prioritization spreadsheet to calculate scores and create preliminary priorities.
 - b. Notes on methodology
 - i. Roles and funding: exist = 2, iffy = 1, doesn't exist = 0
 - ii. Project owners: exist = 3, iffy = 1, doesn't exist = 0
 - iii. Effort level in person/hours, including all team members, meetings, etc, but not including time paid via a budget (e.g. paid vendor).
 1. Low (Easy score = 3): 1 – 100
 2. Medium (Easy score = 2) 100-200
 3. High (Easy score = 1) 200+
 - iv. Likelihood of success score = sum of above scores
 - v. Value score = sum of all responses from survey to CC members
 1. High need = 3
 2. Medium need = 2
 3. Low need = 1
 4. No need = 0
 - vi. Priority Score = Value score multiplied by Success score

- 5 **Coordinating Committee Adjusts the Priority Rank**
 - a. At CC meeting show the spreadsheet & get corroboration from CC (any errors?)
 - b. Priority rank will initially be the same as priority score
 - c. CC can then discuss and adjust priority rankings if desired based on other factors (group wisdom)
 - d. CC should also decide which projects to completely remove from the work plan.
 - e. Where a project is important, but missing roles or funding, CC could re-evaluate in the future.

Work Plan Prioritization Matrix

Project Name	Do In 2013	CC Priority Rank	CC Value Score	CC Success Score	Owner Exists	Work Team Exists	Active Champ Exists	Funding Exists	Level of Effort
Re-launch metrogis.org	X	1	32	10	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	High
Support the Centerlines Initiative	X	2	31	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
Support Geospatial Commons	X	3	28	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a	High
Deploy Collaborative Tools	X	4	28	10	Yes	No	n/a	Yes	Low
Improve Address Point Editing Tool	X	5	25	11	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	Med
Develop Address Points Dataset	X	6	32	8	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	High
Implement Leadership Succession	X	7	28	8	Yes	No	No	n/a	Low
Complete Communications Plan		8	31	10	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	Low
Develop Performance Metrics		9	25	5	No	No	No	n/a	Low
Facilitate a Data Exchange Between Counties & Commercial Real Estate		10	17	4	No	No	No	n/a	Med
Increase Frequency of Parcel Data		11	19	3	No	No	No	No	Low
Create Regional Base Map Service		12	26	2	No	No	No	No	Med
Fund & Support "Follow On" QPV		13	21	2	No	No	No	No	Med