

Strategic and Business Plan Development for Maryland in Support of The NSDI Future Directions Fifty States Initiative

Maryland Spatial Data Infrastructure Strategic Planning Committee Minutes

September 15, 2006

Present:

Chair: Matt Felton

Staff: Missy Valentino, Susan Wooden, Gloria Yeatman

Members: David Gillum, Marshall Stevenson, Roger Barlow, Tom Nasuta, Frank Siano, Shawn Wampler, Virginia Peterman, Bruce Eikenberg, Victor Henry, Mike Sheffer

Guest: Mike Baxter (SHA)

Absent: Ken Miller, Richard Leadbeater, Jack Martin, Michael Scott, Jennifer Gajewski, Jennifer Schottke, Chuck Bristow, John Contestabile, Charlene Howard, Mike Lettré, Warren Campbell, Shahbaz Raza, Jim Thomas

Location: Towson University Campus, 7800 Building, Room 121

The meeting began at 1:30 p.m. and ended at 3:30 p.m.

Topics of Discussion

1. Update from State CIO's Office

Bruce Eikenberg announced that Ellis Kitchen (State CIO) feels that the GIO position should be part of the Department of Budget and Management (DBM). No decision has been made about the location of a coordinating body or the GIO, although Towson University is the most likely site at this time. DBM still plans to fill the role of the Data Coordinator position that was previously approved, but this position will be general data coordination and not explicitly GIS. GIS Coordination and data standards (to include GIS data) have been identified as a priority for 2008. (*Note from SPC staff: The following text is taken from the State of Maryland Information Technology Master Plan FY 2008 prepared in July 2006.*)

Standardize and Consolidate Geographical Information Systems (GIS)

Geographical information can be used by a number of State agencies for such diverse uses as growth planning, emergency response coordination, environmental monitoring and capital asset management. Because agencies have developed applications independently, there are multiple systems with concomitant issues of incompatibilities, information sharing limitations, multiple licenses, increased maintenance, and competing efforts to fund common initiatives such as aerial photographing of the State's land mass.

Similar to other areas of the State's IT enterprise, a consolidation of GIS applications, establishment of data standards and collaborative funding can lead to more innovative services at a lower aggregate cost. Toward that end, in conjunction with the data standards initiative discussed earlier, DBM will collaborate with those agencies with a prevalent GIS program to establish a governance model, determine requirements, and to assess and develop a consolidated strategy for maximizing GIS statewide. There are numerous services that can be offered once the systems have been consolidated, including monitoring waterway sediment, confirming preserved land is being appropriately managed, advance planning for evacuation during disruptive events, an inventory of highways and their appurtenances and locating people in need of assistance in remote areas.

http://dbm.maryland.gov/dbm_publishing/public_content/dbm_search/technology/policyplanning/fy2008stateitmp.pdf

Matt Felton reported that he and Kenny Miller had a productive meeting with Ellis Kitchen at the MACo conference in August. Mr. Kitchen wants to visit Towson University to see the GIS facility. Mr. Eikenberg can assist with arranging the visit if needed.

Dave Gillum announced that the Centerline project is in its second phase. Work on five additional counties is now proceeding, and committees and working groups are being formed. Baltimore County is well engaged. Project participants are assisting counties that lack resources.

Mike Sheffer and Roger Barlow commented on the legal issues they have encountered relative to funding being offered to USGS by the Navy (from FY 2006) for the orthoimagery project. The funding cannot be accepted due to lack of an approved process for transferring the money from one fiscal year to another and from one agency to another. FY 2006 money must be cleared and "off the USGS books" by September 30. This is too short a time frame to transfer the funds from the Navy to USGS and then to Maryland SHA via the existing bureaucratic document preparation and signature process, which requires a minimum of 60 days. (*Note from SPC staff: minutes from the Orthoimagery Statewide Acquisition kickoff meeting offer an explanation of funding arrangements and management. The minutes can be found at <http://www.msgic.state.md.us/publicat/imagpart06/Minutes010906.pdf>.)*

Roger Barlow suggested that including DC imagery in the flyover will enable Maryland and DC to share resources. Technical requirements are being developed for the RFP for orthoimagery acquisition. Given the funding situation, a spring flight schedule is ambitious, but still the current plan. Matt Felton stated that TU has the ability to "hold funds" across fiscal years and could serve as a backup resource if conflicts in funding transfers arise.

The loss of the Navy's funding (\$40,000) for shared orthophotography is a useful anecdote when making the case for a statewide GIS coordinating entity that has fiscal authority.

2. Status Reports

a) Overall Timeline

According to the timeline drafted prior to project kickoff, we are on schedule.

b) Review Interim Report

A draft of the Interim Report was distributed prior to the meeting via e-mail. Comments were received and accepted. Susan Wooden will revise and finalize the draft and then e-mail the report with attachments to Milo Robinson on Monday, September 18.

c) Review MMRG Redesign

The go-live date for the MMRG redesign will be approximately 9/29. Matt Felton requested feedback on the redesign. He will meet with Kevin Boone to discuss tying MSGIC to MMRG more effectively. He also wants the featured projects page to be a dynamic resume of Maryland, versus an unchanging page. He requested that committee members continue to submit projects. Project descriptions, graphics, and PowerPoints can be e-mailed to Missy Valentino (mvalentino@towson.edu), who can also help with screen shots as needed. Susan Wooden can edit text as needed. Eventually, the links will be more dynamic. Discussion occurred about adding an Events page as a subhead under “Featured GIS Activities” that would list or link to information about conferences, outreach, training, etc. ESRI’s Web site features an event page we can link to, and eliminates the need to manage schedules of vendor events. Mike Sheffer will provide other vendor links, as well. MMRG can also link to www.GIS.com for the benefit anyone not familiar with GIS. Dave Gillum suggested posting notices of upcoming MSGIC meetings.

3. Discussion of Strategic Plan Draft

- a. Hard copies of the draft plan were distributed.
- b. At this stage, the audience is primarily Ellis Kitchen, since he put his office and position forward as the agency champion of the end result and since the timing is not optimal for appealing to the political process. The plan must stand on its own. Executive Order is possibly the best method for approval now and longterm. Matt Felton has accomplished considerable grass roots campaigning via multiple presentations (i.e., ESRI Regional User Groups), and has also taken advantage of the opportunity to speak with Jim Geringer (former Governor of Wyoming, currently with ESRI,) about the advantages of Executive Order.
- c. Comments and discussion followed on individual sections of the plan.

1. Executive Summary: Solution and Recommendations

Should the GIO be a “deputy” CIO?

Mike Sheffer suggested adding Salisbury University, UMBC, and Frostburg State University to TU’s function as the technical site for GIS coordination, since each

institution possesses a core set of data, and since inclusion would unify the Maryland University system relative to GIS coordination. Virginia Peterman agreed. Matt Felton responded that academic partnerships are addressed in a later section of the plan.

Roger Barlow added that we must determine how to coordinate with cross-cutting groups. The governance structure of “Network Maryland” was suggested as a corresponding IT model. Matt Felton indicated that the recommended GIS governance structure of the MSDI plan is modeled after the SIEC and the Governance Working Group, which, along with Network Maryland, have proven to be successful models for Maryland.

The four bulleted items in the Executive Summary were reworded based on group discussion.

2. Executive Summary: Fiscal Impact

General comments: funding for statewide data projects is definitely deficient, and costs are likely to exceed original suppositions. It is difficult to make hard cost comparisons between projected cost with coordination versus the cost of doing business as usual.

SHA and Kenny Miller are the appropriate sources for cost figures for the centerline and orthoimagery projects. Mike Sheffer will ask John Joyce if there are guesstimates on savings from the floodplain project. Perhaps figures are available at the county level.

Roger Barlow suggested that beyond cost, coordination enhances the ability to govern and also increases standards of emergency response.

“Non-Fiscal Impact” was added as a subsection.

Matt Felton requested members to send anecdotes and case studies to Susan Wooden that help make the case for our recommendations. Mike Sheffer mentioned a case involving a citizen complaint against a trespasser. DNR and SHA were able to address the citizen’s needs in a cooperative arrangement.

A BMC staff member is responsible for procurement; Victor Henry will ask him for cost information.

3. Key Elements: GIO

Kenny Miller is working on a job description for the GIO.
Group discussion rendered a list of benefits.

4. Section 5.3: Performance Standards and Measurement of Return on Investment

Roger Barlow suggested quantifying the cost that counties incurred in past years with orthoimagery and use it as a basis for comparison. Matt Felton asked if there is anything

in the state's documentation that would be helpful. Bruce Eikenberg will send links to Matt relative to GIS work on regional data projects such as transportation, traffic congestion, and coordination efforts with WASH-COG.

4. Next Steps

a) Proposed Business Plan Priorities

One approach is to seek sustainable funding for the GIO and technical services arm. Financial analysis of the orthoimagery project can be used as an example.

Dave Gillum: are we discussing the project lifecycle—how to find grant funding, responding to RFPs, managing grant funding? Matt Felton responded that we will look at all processes. He suggested an approach of dividing the committee into subgroups to explore different topics.

b) "Selling the Story"

Virginia Peterman recommended having Bill Burgess (NSGIC) review the final draft of the plan.

Susan Wooden will incorporate today's edits and then e-mail the draft report to SPC members.

5. Wrap up

The meeting ended at 3:30 p.m.

Recording: Susan Wooden

Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewed: Matt Felton



August 3, 2006

Signature _____ Date _____