MetroGIS
2014 Work Plan

Adopted by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
January 9, 2014

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

MetroGIS 2014 Work Plan

Table of Contents

Contact

Questions about this document may be directed to: *Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator*
                                390 Robert Street North
                                St Paul, Minnesota, 55101
                                geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn.us
                                651.602.1638

What is MetroGIS?

MetroGIS is voluntary collaborative of government, private sector, non-profit and academic interests that works to serve the on-going need 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;*

MetroGIS' 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*

Sponsorship Statement

The work of MetroGIS is made possible and strengthened by the range of resources offered by its stakeholder community. Since MetroGIS' inception in 1995, the Metropolitan Council has provided the financial resources and administrative oversight to the collaborative, while other agencies, organizations and governments 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.

Introduction

The purpose of the MetroGIS Work Plan document is provides a summary of the projects and activities to be undertaken in calendar 2014 by the MetroGIS collaborative. The Work Plan is intended to be a living document subject to change by the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee.

Revision Procedure

The MetroGIS Coordinating Committee will formally revisit and edit the Work Plan once per year (generally the September Committee meeting) to chart the progress of existing projects and include new projects which rise in priority and interest. The Work Plan will be used to direct and program 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. For a new project recommendation, a Coordinating Committee member may propose the project at a quarterly meeting. Committee members are encouraged to indicate the following regarding their proposed project:

- A project **owner**: *A person who would serve in a leadership role for the project, to act as its spokes person and steward;*

- A project **champion**: *A person at senior management or policy-maker level who can advocate for the benefits of the project and its outcomes;*

- A project **work team**: *A group of individuals committed to the work tasks, review, course correction and implementation of the project;*

- A **statement of the need** for and **benefit** of the proposed project;

- A recommendation as to **budget requirements** and possible **funding source(s)**;

Upon receiving project proposals, the Coordinating Committee may then decide to:

- Postpone the project until the next annual planning cycle;

- Accept the project to be worked on in the current year and prioritize it relative to the other projects schedule for this year;

- Direct the Coordinator, Committee members, other staff or duly appointed party to conduct further research on behalf of the project and bring their findings to the Committee.

Publication and Availability of the Work Plan

Revision and re-publication of the Work Plan document is the responsibility of the MetroGIS Coordinator or a duly appointed designee by the Coordinating Committee. 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.

MetroGIS Coordinating Committee Members, 2014

David Bitner, *dbSpatial*

William Brown, *Hennepin County*

Jim Bunning, *Scott County*

Jim Fritz, Xcel Energy

Matt Baker, *Metro Airports Commission*

Mark Kotz, *Metropolitan Council*

Eric Haugen, Resource Data, Inc.

Brad Henry, *University of Minnesota*

Randy Knippel, *Dakota County*

Tim Loesch, *MnDNR*

Mark Maloney, *City of Shoreview*

Dan Ross, State GIO, *MnGeo*

John Slusarczyk, *Anoka County*

Sally Wakefield, *SharedGeo/Non-Profits*

David Brandt, Vice Chair, *Washington County*

Erik Dahl, Chair, *Minnehaha Creek Watershed District*

Harold Busch/Bob O'Neill, Bloomington/*Metro Cities*

Ron Wencl, *USGS*

Gordon Chinander, *Metro Emerg. Services Board*

Ben Butzow, *MnDOT*

Len Kne, *U-Spatial, University of Minnesota*

Peter Henschel, *Carver County*

Matt Koukol, *Ramsey County*

Ben Verbick, *LOGIS*

Jeff Matson, *CURA/MN Council of Non-Profits*

Nancy Read, *Metropolitan Mosquito Control Board*

Gary Swenson, *Hennepin County*

MetroGIS Staff:

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

Paul Peterson, MetroGIS Project Manager

Summary of Accomplishments in 2013

The last Work Plan cycle for MetroGIS was November 2012 through November 2013. The following activities from the past twelve months represent the key successes of the collaborative in serving the geospatial community of the metropolitan area.

MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset

Maintenance and distribution of the Regional Parcel Dataset has continued, with 132 current registered users of the dataset.

Datafinder.org

MetroGIS continues to support, maintain and update the DataFinder data clearinghouse website. As of November 12, 2013 there are 296 datasets available from datafinder.org.

NCompass Centerline Dataset

In 2011, MetroGIS facilitated the renewal of the contract between the Metropolitan Council and private data vendor NCompass. MetroGIS continues to facilitate and oversee the operation of this agreement through 2016. 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. As of November 12, 2013, there are 81 registered users of the NCompass Centerline Dataset.

Minnesota Geospatial Commons

The MetroGIS community actively supports the development and future availability of the Geospatial Commons. MnGeo has taken the lead role in the Commons' development. An internal rollout (Version 1.0) of the Commons occurred in early fall, with a demonstration to the Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council in September. Initial deployment of the Commons' is anticipated in 2014.

Statewide Centerlines Initiative

MetroGIS has been working in continued partnership with MnDOT, MnGeo and the Metropolitan Council examining the potential for a new sustainable centerline road data solution. Up to 2013, MetroGIS co-sponsored several input events with MnDOT and MnGeo. MetroGIS so-sponsored and co-facilitated a pilot participant event with MnDOT and MnGeo in Baxter, MN in May 2013. The Metropolitan Council assigned a project manager (Paul Peterson) to shepherd the project, document core stakeholder business needs and collect requirements of the pilot partners.

The pilot project plan was developed in late summer/fall of 2013 and as of this writing is under final review by the pilot project participants (Ramsey, Carver, Stearns, Benton, Mahnomen counties and the White Earth Nation). The project team has developed an initial work breakdown schedule with dates for task completion. The draft pilot plan will be offered to MnDOT in early 2014 for specific actions and direction.

Regional Address Points Web Editing Tool (Version 2.0)

A second, enhanced version of the MetroGIS Address Points Editing Tool is on track for completion and availability by December 31, 2013. The Address Point Web Editing Tool—freely available to all government entities throughout the state of Minnesota—is an ArcGIS Server solution that is being hosted by metro counties to enables cities to create and update address points. The Version 2.0 of the tool will have enhanced tools and functionality, support multi-point editing, support authority specific 'pick lists', support use of preliminary plats, allow use of multiple services and make parcel PIN attribute names configurable.

Regional Address Points Dataset Aggregation Project

To assemble the address points that are being collected and stored at each county, a work team was convened in 2013. The team is tasked with of developing a workflow and technical solution for gathering, aggregating and distributing the address points as they are created and ready to be made available. The work team agreed to utilize the Geospatial Data Resource Site (GDRS) technology as their point of beginning to aggregate points. Standards, methods and practices on how to best utilize the GDRS remain in development.

Stormsewer Project Investigation

Building upon the initial technical work which occurred in 2009 and 2010, a significant amount of research and needs assessment documentation on the feasibility for a regional stormsewer project took place in 2013 including:

- Numerous one-on-one information sessions with key stakeholders and interested agencies;
- Outreach to core organizations, groups and senior officials with interest in the availability of a stormsewer dataset;
- Collection of letters of support from stakeholder agencies;
- Initial documentation of the importance of the issues to be served by developing this dataset;

The work performed in 2013 was intended to lay the foundation for more formal programmatic work in calendar year 2014 on the regional stormsewer dataset initiative.

Deployment of Collaborative Tools

Many projects led and sponsored by MetroGIS stakeholders have provided collaboration site resources for project colleagues to share documents.

- MnGeo is sponsoring a collaborative eShare site for the Statewide Centerlines Initiative.
- Dakota County sponsors a collaborative eShare site for the on-going work of the Data Producers Work Group.
- The Metropolitan Council provides an eShare site for MetroGIS projects. Each member of the Coordinating Committee has access to this site

Payments to Data Producer Counties in the Seven County Metropolitan Region
As per the legal agreement through 2016 between the Seven Metropolitan Counties and the Metropolitan Council; MetroGIS ensures payments are made to county governments for continued improvements and enhancements of the Regional Parcel Dataset. This includes timely metadata updates and continued availability of the historic (three years old and older) parcel dataset via DataFinder.org.

Leadership Succession Plan and Operational Procedures and Guidelines Review
In 2013, a thorough review and revision of needed portions of the MetroGIS' Operational Procedures and Guidelines was undertaken. Several members of the collaborative generously offered to review the document and offered their comments and critique on ways to modify the document. Key modifications included how new members are added to the Coordinating Committee and that the Work Plan and budget are the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee and not the Policy Board.

Progress on the New MetroGIS website
Significant back-end hosting, design and new content development progress has been made in launching a new website for MetroGIS. The Metropolitan Council has assumed financial and managerial responsibility for the new site and appropriated $60,000 for its deployment. As of November 2013, the Metropolitan Council has successfully identified and negotiated with a web-development vendor and is finalizing the contract with production to begin in late November 2013. The new site will be hosted by the Metropolitan Council and will utilize the Kentico Content Management System.

MetroGIS Coordinator Geoff Maas has assumed the responsibility to distill the content from the existing website, develop the content for the new site, and facilitate the archiving of original materials from the old site. Usability testing of the new site is scheduled to take place in December 2013 through January 2014 with the full new site to be available to the public by March 31, 2014.

New Logo & Branding
As an extension of the new website, MetroGIS has developed and adopted a new logo and graphic identity for both the DataFinder and MetroGIS; these new logos were developed over the summer of 2013 and approved for use on September 19, 2013 by the Coordinating Committee.

Advocacy and Outreach

MetroGIS assumes a role in advocacy for geospatial needs and initiatives and conducts outreach on the benefits of geospatial technology.

Free & Open Data Research and Policy Board Support

On October 23, 2013, the MetroGIS Policy Board approved a Resolution of Support for the free and open movement of public geospatial data in the Seven Metropolitan Counties. This Resolution of Support comes as a final act from many years of focused debate and discussion on the issue.

The MetroGIS Data Producers Work Group spent a significant part of 2013 developing research materials on the topic. These included a detailed white paper summary of benefits and challenges to free and open data, a summary fact sheet, case law reviews, interviews with governments already making data free, as well as statue language review and legal research to understand to issues of liability and data access.

The formal support from the MetroGIS Policy Board is an important step to assisting city and county governments of the Metropolitan region in adopting policies and practices to make their data freely and openly available.

Formal MetroGIS Outreach Efforts

In order to demonstrate the value and benefits of MetroGIS and the status of its current projects and results of its research, a number of presentations have been developed and given to the following agencies, departments and organizations during 2013:

Metropolitan Council Community Development Review Team, St Paul	Feb 2013
MnDOT Metro Office GIS Staff, Roseville	Apr 2013
LOGIS (Local Government Information Systems), Golden Valley	May 2013
Metropolitan Council Information Services Department, St Paul	May 2013
Visualizing Neighborhoods: A Hackathon for Good, Hennepin County Public Library	May 2013
Metro Engineers and Public Works Directors Group, Roseville	Aug 2013
Metro Cities Executive Committee, St Paul	Aug 2013
Metropolitan Council Executive Committee, St Paul	Sept 2013
Metropolitan Council Communications Department, St Paul	Oct 2013
CityCampMN – Hackathon Event, St. Thomas University, St Paul	Nov 2013
Free & Open Data: Issues & Benefits – Hennepin County Staff, GIS Day, Minneapolis	Nov 2013

Maintenance Activities

MetroGIS assumes a core maintenance role for a variety of activities serving the geospatial community of the metropolitan region.

(1) Regional Parcel Dataset

MetroGIS provides on-going custodial support and maintenance for the Regional Parcel Dataset. This includes maintenance of license agreements, 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. 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.

MetroGIS Projects for 2014

The following pages provide a one-page synopsis of each MetroGIS 2014 project. A short summary of the non-2014 projects discussed or planned for future work plans is also provided.

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 project cycle and from the identified 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: identified stakeholder business needs, likelihood of success and availability of funding. A more detailed description of the prioritization methodology is available in Appendix A.

Project or Initiative	Work on in 2014	Committee Ranking	Priority Score
Address Points Aggregation	Yes	1	506
Free & Open Data Initiative	Yes	2	473
Support for Geospatial Commons	Yes	3	410
Address Points Editor 2.1 *(Tool Enhancements)*	Yes	4	385
Support for Statewide Centerlines Initiative	Yes	5	410
Increased Sharing Beyond Metro	Yes	6	390
Increase Private/Public Data Sharing	Yes	7	287
Private/Public Data Sharing Summit	Yes	8	259
Regional Stormsewer Dataset	Yes	9	210
Increase Frequency of Parcel Data Updates	No	10	150
Create Regional Base Map Service	No	11	96
QPV Follow-On	No	12	44
Regional Building Footprint Data	No	13	35
High Res Impervious Surface Data	No	14	27

#1 - Address Points Aggregation Project

Project Brief	Development and documentation of a workflow process and technical solution for the gathering, aggregating and distributing address points as they are created and ready to be made available.
Critical Stakeholders	Stakeholders using addressing points Addressing Authorities (primarily cities) Data aggregators (County Governments and MetCouncil)
Priority Level	**1st; Identified as Top Priority by Coordinating Committee**
Budget	If an aggregation tool cannot be developed within a state or county agency to push address point data to the GDRS, a consultant may be needed to develop the tool.
Benefit to Stakeholders	Stakeholders will have access to more accurate data for geocoding services. 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 with have better growth monitoring data.
Project Owner	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	MetroGIS Address Points Aggregation Group
Expected Timeline	Begun in Fall 2013, On-going into 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Testing and documentation of GDRS as means of aggregating of points
Policy Implications	Securing permission for public dissemination of address point data from cities and counties
Notes:	On-going through 2014;

#2 - Free & Open Data Initiative

Project Brief	Conduct and publish research on the benefits, challenges, impacts and legal implications of making public geospatial data freely and openly available to all users and requestors; Perform outreach to stakeholders, policy makers and interested agencies on the means to, and possible impacts of, freely and openly available public geospatial data;
Critical Stakeholders	Entire MetroGIS Community (all data users) All Authoritative Data Producers presently charging fees or requiring licenses for use of and access to their geospatial data;
Priority Level	**2nd**
Budget	Funding Not Needed. The research is conducted in the course of the duties of the staff involved.
Benefit to Stakeholders	Public geospatial data available without cost or licensure
Project Owner(s)	Dan Ross, State Geographic Information Systems Officer Randy Knippel, Dakota County GIS Manager/Work Group Chair Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion(s)	Terry Schneider, Policy Board Chair Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County Commissioner Jim Kordiak, Anoka County Commissioner Chris Gerlach, Dakota County Commissioner
Project Team	MetroGIS Data Producers Work Group
Expected Timeline	On-going into 2014
Milestones	Change in county policies and practices making data free/open
Policy Implications	The project would yield a significant change in existing county policy in Minnesota regarding data availability.
Notes	On-Going Through 2014 Work on Free and Open Data will be conducted as demanded by need. Research and outreach will be performed at the request of MetroGIS governing bodies or stakeholder organizations.

#3 - Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons

Project Brief	The MN Geospatial Commons is intended to be a single web location where GIS users can find and share 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 supporting participant.
Critical Stakeholders	MnGeo, all MetroGIS stakeholders Spatial data users in the State of Minnesota
Priority Level	**3rd**
Budget	No MetroGIS funding needed Staff time/commitments of stakeholders
Benefit to Stakeholders	Having a single, trusted source for publicly available geospatial resources in Minnesota, and having a data sharing portal solution for those organizations that do not maintain their own portal
Project Owner(s)	Dan Ross, State Geographic Information Systems Officer
Project Champion(s)	Dan Ross, State Geographic Information Systems Officer Carolyn Parnell, MN CIO
Project Team	Geospatial Commons Development Team
Expected Timeline	Deployment anticipated for July 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Roll-Out of First Version for Public Access Deployment of first public version in July 2014
Policy Implications	Availability of Public Geospatial Data for which cities and counties are the authoritative source.

#4 – Address Points Editor 2.1 (Enhancements)

Project Brief	Additional functionality and enhancement of the MetroGIS Address Points Editor Tool 2.0 completed in 2013;
Critical Stakeholders	County Governments City Governments Emergency Response/911 Community
Priority Level	**4th**
Budget	Estimated at $17,500
Benefit to Stakeholders	Several counties have defined a business need to have such an application to facilitate address points data collection and maintenance with their cities. Capacity for the continued refinement of existing tools would be beneficial.
Project Owner	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Project Champion	Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Project Team	MetroGIS Address Points Work Group
Expected Timeline	Version 2.1 of the tool available in Fall 2014.
Key Steps Milestones	Version 2.0 Complete and In Use by January 2014 Version 2.1 Complete and In Use by January 2015
Policy Implications	None

#5 - Support for the Statewide Centerlines Initiative

Project Brief	The Statewide 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 creating consuming and using street centerline data in Minnesota.
Priority Level	**5th**
Budget	Staff time of stakeholder participants
Benefit to Stakeholders	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.
Project Owner	Dan Ross, MnGeo
Project Champions	Dan Ross, MnGeo Peter Morey, MnDOT
Project Team	Statewide Centerline Initiative Work Team Centerline Steering Committee
Expected Timeline	On-going through 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Finalization of MnDOT Business Requirements Approval of Pilot Project Development of initial tool suite and data ingest from pilot partners
Policy Implications	To be determined
Notes	On-going through 2014

#6 – Increased Data Sharing Beyond the Metro

Project Brief	MetroGIS wishes to ways to engage, share data and collaborate with its partner counties, organizations and geospatial interests which are outside of the seven-county-metropolitan area. This would not be intended to lead to formal work, its primary aim is to build relationships and determine shared areas of interest and possible future work;
Critical Stakeholders	MetroGIS Stakeholders desiring data from neighboring areas Non-metro geospatial interests adjacent to the metro who wish to engage with the MetroGIS stakeholders
Priority Level	**6th**
Budget	$750
Benefit to Stakeholders	Development and strengthening of relationships with geospatial partners and interests adjacent to the Seven Metropolitan Counties;
Project Owner	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	MetroGIS Coordinating Committee (review team)
Expected Timeline	On-going through 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Outreach to each county manager bordering the Seven Metropolitan Counties; Increase in communication to other regional geospatial collaboratives operating in the state;
Policy Implications	None
Notes	On-going through 2014

#7 – Increased Private/Public Data Sharing

Project Brief	MetroGIS wishes to welcome, engage, share data with and seek ways to collaborate with its partner organizations and businesses in the private sector. The aim of this initiative is to build relationships and determine shared areas of interest and possible future work.
Critical Stakeholders	All geospatial data users in the Seven Metropolitan County Region
Priority Level	**7th (Development tied to 8th Priority on next page)**
Budget	No budget required
Benefit to Stakeholders	Development of an increased awareness of the legal, policy, economic and other issues which foster or hinder wider data availability from both the public and private sector; Development of increased capacity for relationship building, issue awareness and setting the stage for more future work;
Project Owner	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	Private/Public Data Sharing Work Team *(a subset of the Coordinating Committee)* to be identified in early 2014;
Expected Timeline	Preparation and Development in Early 2014 Summit in Summer/Fall 2014 Report and Next Steps Identified in Late 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Identification of key individuals to participate in dialogue and meeting events. Assigning a date, time, venue for the Private/Public Summit
Policy Implications	None
Notes	Background work for/directly to Private/Public Data Summit (#8 below)

#8 – Private/Public Data Sharing Summit

Project Brief	MetroGIS to develop, host and report back from a summit meeting of private and public geospatial data developers and users to identify common shared needs, challenges, benefits and obstacles to wider geospatial data availability between the private and public sectors
Critical Stakeholders	Public data producers and consumers Private data producers and consumers
Priority Level	**8th**
Budget	$1500 [for facility rental and refreshments]
Benefit to Stakeholders	Ability to meet and develop relationships; Forum for revealing and documenting needs, benefits and challenges
Project Owner	Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	N/A
Project Team	**Private/Public Data Sharing Work Team** (a subset of the Coordinating Committee) to be identified in early 2014;
Expected Timeline	Preparation in Early 2014 Event in Late Summer/Fall 2014 Report back/Next Steps in Fall 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Identification of key individuals to participate in dialogue and meeting events. Assigning a date, time, venue for the Private/Public Summit Successful event and report back
Policy Implications	None
Notes	

#9 – Regional Stormsewer Dataset

Project Brief	The MetroGIS collaborative is exploring the potential of working with a broad group of interested stakeholders toward the development of a Regional Stormsewer GIS Dataset. In 2010, a Draft Digital Stormwater Data Exchange Transfer Standard was developed, as well as a pilot project focused on gathering and assessing data in the Ramsey-Washington-Metro Watershed District. This project would build upon past work and existing relationships to assess the fitness of the draft Transfer Standard, and develop a pilot project.
Critical Stakeholders	Any agency desiring stormsewer asset data in a standardized geospatial format for mapping, modeling and tracking; these include the Metropolitan Council, watershed districts, metro cities, MnDOT, Metro Mosquito Control, county soil and water conservation services and interested parties in academia, engineering, planning and other disciplines.
Priority Level	**9th**
Budget	No MetroGIS funding needed Staff time of stakeholders
Benefit to Stakeholders	Increasing the understanding of the stormwater coming into their city (from neighboring communities) and leaving it; Facilitating Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination programs; Assisting with the maintenance and protection of their parks and natural areas which handle stormwater. Simplifying and reducing the of cost their surface water planning and improvement programs; Easing inter-agency interaction regarding the stormwater resource and the stormsewer asset data; Assisting in making their MPCA MS4 reporting requirements and their other reporting requirements more efficient; Assisting with the development of their digital infrastructure asset management applications
Project Owners	Erik Dahl, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator
Project Champion	(Senior Environmental Services Staff), Metropolitan Council
Project Team:	Stormsewer Project Team (To be reactivated from 2010 participants)
Expected Timeline:	On-going into 2014
Key Steps Milestones	Acquire permission to use and disburse earlier Pilot Project Data; Develop Project Plan;
Policy Implications:	Need for clarity and documentation on the availability, distribution and use of authoritative (city) data for use and re-distribution

Remaining Project List

The following projects did not meet the requisite criteria for inclusion in active Work Plan projects in calendar 2014. These projects will be revisited in September 2014 for potential inclusion in 2015 Work Plan and removed from the list upon the vote of the Coordinating Committee.

Remaining Projects	Brief Description
Increase frequency of Parcel Data Updates	*Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority;*
Development of Regional Base Map Services	*Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority;*
Fund and Support 'Follow On' for QPV (Quantifying Public Value) study	*Existing study and other available research materials serves the present purposes of describing public value. A follow on study was not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority. The project does not meet an existing stakeholder need.*
Regional Building Footprint Dataset	*Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority*
High Resolution Impervious Surface Dataset	*Not identified by the Coordinating Committee as a priority*

MetroGIS 2014 Budget

MetroGIS' core financial support is provided by the Metropolitan Council. The annual budget can be placed into two general categories: **Program Budget** and **Project Budget**. The **Program Budget (page 22)** is chiefly concerned with established obligations and maintenance of operations. The **Project Budget (page 23)** is for the new and on-going project work of the collaborative.

MetroGIS 2014
Program Budget

Project	Funding Amount	Project Lead(s)	Project Team or Review Body
Annual Contract Payments to Metropolitan Counties for Parcel Data Improvements	$28,000	Geoff Maas	GIS Managers of the Seven Metropolitan Counties
Web Domain Registrations, Printing, Refreshment, Travel, Supplies & Miscellaneous Funds	$4,500	Geoff Maas	MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
New MetroGIS Website Deployment	$60,000*	Geoff Maas	MetroGIS Communications Workgroup
TOTAL	$92,500		

MetroGIS 2014 Project Budget

Project	Funding Amount	Project Lead(s)	Project Team or Review Body
#1 - Address Points Aggregation Project	*No MetroGIS Funding Required*	**Mark Kotz**	**MetroGIS Address Points Aggregation Group**
#2 - Free and Open Data Initiative	*No MetroGIS Funding Required*	**Dan Ross Randy Knippel Geoff Maas**	**Coordinating Committee & MetroGIS Data Producers Work Group**
#3 - Support for the Minnesota Geospatial Commons	*No MetroGIS Funding Required*	**Dan Ross**	**Coordinating Committee**
#4 – Address Points Editor 2.1 (Enhancements)	*Estimated at $17,500**	**Mark Kotz**	**MetroGIS Address Points Aggregation Group**
#5 - Support for the Statewide Centerlines Initiative	*No MetroGIS Funding Required*	**Dan Ross Peter Morey Paul Peterson Geoff Maas Mark Kotz**	**Centerline Work Group & Centerline Steering Committee**
#6 – Increased Data Sharing Beyond the Metro	*~$750: part of Miscellaneous Funds*	**Geoff Maas**	**Coordinating Committee**
#7 – Increased Private/Public Data Sharing	*No Funding Required*	**Geoff Maas**	**Coordinating Committee**
#8 – Private/Public Data Sharing Summit Event	*~$1500: part of Miscellaneous Funds*	**Geoff Maas**	**Coordinating Committee**
#9 – Regional Stormsewer Dataset	*No MetroGIS Funding Required*	**Erik Dahl Geoff Maas**	**Stormsewer Data Work Group**
TOTALS			

*This funding would be above and beyond the allotted MetroGIS budget for 2014. Funding from stakeholders is to be considered. MetroGIS will develop and deliver a business case to the Metropolitan Council for funding consideration.

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 <u>preliminary</u> 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 = <u>Value score</u> multiplied by <u>Success score</u>

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.