

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

December 18, 2006

Present:

Chairs: Matt Felton,

Guest: Milo Robinson, Framework & Cooperating States Coordinator,
USGS/FGDC/NSDI

Dave Foreman (representing MD DNR)

Staff: Missy Valentino, Susan Wooden, Gloria Yeatman

Members: Warren Campbell, Virginia Peterman, David Gillum, Marshall Stevenson, Roger Barlow, Mike Sheffer, Tom Nasuta, Richard Leadbeater, Bruce Eikenberg, Charlene Howard, Jennifer Schottke

Absent: Ken Miller, Chuck Bristow, Bill Burgess, John Contestabile, Victor Henry, Jennifer Gajewski, Mike Lettré, Jack Martin, Shahbaz Raza, Michael Scott, Frank Siano, Jim Thomas, Shawn Wampler

Location: Towson University Campus, Administration Building, Room 120

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. and ended at 2:30 p.m.

Topics of Discussion

1. Introductions

Matt Felton introduced guest Milo Robinson of USGS, who is responsible for the 50 States Initiative grants. Mr. Robinson announced that 10-12 more states will receive funding for strategic and business plans for statewide coordination, bringing the total to 30 states thus far. The USGS/FGDC/NSDI cooperative agreement RFP has been issued. *Category 5, Geographic Information Integration and Analysis*, seems to be the best fit for Maryland, because the topic is regional data relationships. However, the category targets groups that are new to the CAP grant process, which precludes TU-CGIS and MSGIC from being the project lead. A possible candidate project would be a partnership with Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (WashCOG) to integrate centerline data across the MD/DC line. Charlene Howard will bring this up at the next WashCog and/or subcommittee meeting.

2. Updates

MMRG Web Site: Matt Felton showed the GIS Coordination pages on the new MMRG site, as well as the Featured GIS Projects pages. He requested that members send project slides and

information to Missy Valentino for inclusion on the pages. The site is a visible, easy tool for those with a need to understand the importance of GIS to the state, counties, and municipalities.

ITAC Meeting Presentation: Matt Felton spoke about GIS Coordination and key GIS projects at the recent ITAC meeting. The presentation went well, although no questions or discussion occurred afterward.

Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC): TU-CGIS is working with Greg Presbury, Traffic Records Coordinator for the Maryland Highway Safety Office, on a National Highway Traffic Safety Administration project. At Mr. Presbury's request, Matt Felton made a presentation to the TRCC Advisory Board about the Maryland Centerline and Orthoimagery projects, EMMA[®] and MEGIN, and GIS coordination. Mike Sheffer suggested speaking with Corporal Barrello of Maryland State Police after January relative to traffic data projects. Apparently, SHA collects data but the Maryland State Police does not have the capability to use the data as yet.

GIS Coordination Booth at MACo Winter Conference, January 3-5: County participation in and support for GIS coordination is crucial. We will showcase the issues for counties at MACo with the centerline data project. It would be helpful if the county departments of Public Works were united with 911 centers to join the centerline and imagery partnerships, but the often they have their own very specific work flows which are challenging to integrate. Information sharing meetings during the conference will help with getting the message across, and Mike Sheffer will be meeting with individual agencies. SHA, 911, and DPW should be working cooperatively, despite the inherent difficulties to overcome. Pointing out a specific cost savings to the agencies would be useful.

Relative to the advantages of coordinating data updates and making quick, centralized access possible, the recent train derailment in Carroll County near the Howard County line was discussed as a case in point. One overturned tanker was carrying anhydrous ammonia. On the presumption that the gas could leak from the tanker, residents inside a one-mile area were asked to evacuate, and those in a 1-3-mile radius were asked to shelter in place. Per Virginia Peterman, who managed Howard County's GIS component of emergency assistance, obtaining accurate property data was a problem. Data in EMMA[®] were two years old, local ortho images were too old, and inter-jurisdictional data were not optimal. Address points versus aerial imagery were needed. Howard County has 2006 data but experienced much difficulty in obtaining current data for Carroll County. MEMA used EMMA[®] to locate and contact homes and schools within the 1-mile radius. EMMA's point data originates from assessment and taxation data, and the user must click on each SDAT datum to link to the specific address. Offering the hope of additional improvements in the near future, Mike Sheffer stated that by February, enhancements to the SHA Web mapping engine might be in place from MdProperty View. Dave Gillum said that Anne Arundel county will be using a program similar to CitiStat. Virginia Peterman stated that despite the fact that some processes did not work well during the train derailment event, overall there had been a great improvement over the previous five years. Rich Leadbeater asked "What is an actionable item" that county council members need to know? Virginia Peterman would appreciate a MEGIN for accessing reliably current data, especially since Howard County borders six jurisdictions. Apparently, discussion about the same issues is occurring during the WashCOG meetings.

It will be important at MACo to be mindful that many county representatives are newly appointed or elected. Rich Leadbeater suggested that a handout listing the GIS professionals employed by each county would be helpful, along with a list of GIS action items. Marshall Stevenson suggested that ESRI's basic what-is-GIS publication should be distributed. Rich Leadbeater will get adequate copies to him, and he suggested that Matt Felton also distribute information about TUGIS 2007.

TUGIS 2007, March 19 and 20: This year's conference will feature a GIS Coordination track. Marshall Stevenson suggested that it be offered on a complimentary basis for county executives and commissioners. State VIPs should be on hand to speak at the session. Warren Campbell has agreed to speak; John Contestabile will be asked, as well as Ellis Kitchen, state CIO. The uses of GIS for many processes other than making maps, the return on investment at the local level, the cost of GIS resources and data, and the fact that most government work is location-based should be made clear. Matt will discuss the specific arrangements with Jay Morgan, the conference director.

3. Funding

Matt Felton briefly recapped Ellis Kitchen's suggestion for funding based on the Network Maryland model. The idea is not unique: most statewide systems have funding requirements, and large systems are funded similarly to Network Maryland. Good discussion took place about this funding strategy at the recent MSGIC Executive Committee meeting. The consensus is that ROI is greater for state agencies than for local government, because local government has both data and systems in place, however stories such as the recent train derailment (described above) suggest otherwise. At the state level, GIS coordination will consolidate work that is now redundant. It is to the state support agencies' advantage to reach out to counties. Generally, the consensus is that counties will be reluctant to purchase GIS via an arrangement similar to Network Maryland. Rich Leadbeater suggested bundling payment for GIS into payment for other services. To make a business case and qualify for a capital bond, the GIS coordinating body must convince counties to commit to subscribing for GIS services and products. Otherwise, GIS coordination will only be a state entity and not truly coordinated. Jurisdictional data are more current, but the state buys certain data that are given to counties, such as weather data, and the state also gives power outage data to the six power companies in the state. We must write a detailed plan that does not create another bureaucratic layer or regulatory agency. Costs should be bundled and they should be clearly stated. Roger Barlow cautioned that shared data sets must be defined relative to the risk of both taking out a bond and being able to convince counties to pay. Data costs can be measured, and GIS coordination can be proven to be cost effective. Plus, the Year 2 funding cycle will differ from the Year 1 funding cycle and thus more appealing to counties

4. The next meeting will take place on Thursday, January 25, from 1-3 p.m. in the Administration Building, room 120. The focus will be the business plan.

Recording: Susan Wooden

Signature

Date December 20, 2006

Reviewed: Matt Felton

Matt Felton

Signature

Date December 21, 2006