

# 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

November 29, 2006

### **Present:**

**Chairs:** Matt Felton, Ken Miller

**Guest:** Ellis Kitchen, State CIO

**Staff:** Missy Valentino, Susan Wooden, Gloria Yeatman

**Members:** Marshall Stevenson, Bruce Eikenberg, Victor Henry, Warren Campbell, Richard Leadbeater, Jennifer Gajewski, Charlene Howard, Tom Nasuta, Virginia Peterson

**Absent:** Roger Barlow, Chuck Bristow, Bill Burgess, John Contestabile, David Gillum, Mike Lettré, Jack Martin, Shahbaz Raza, Michael Scott, Jennifer Schottke, Mike Sheffer, Frank Siano, Jim Thomas, Shawn Wampler

**Location:** Towson University Campus, Administration Building, Room 120

The meeting began at 1:20 p.m. and ended at 4:20 p.m.

### **Topics of Discussion**

#### 1. Updates

Discussion closely follows the agenda/handout that was distributed at the meeting.

- a) Drafts of the Strategic Plan will continue to be revised with special attention to composition of target audience.
- b) Matt Felton has been invited to present on the topic of GIS Coordination in Maryland at the upcoming December 11 meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Council (ITAC). More information about the ITAC meeting can be found in item #2 in these minutes.
- c) Major Information Technology Development Projects: (MITDP): The GIS project at MAA has recently been deemed a MITDP. When deemed as such, IT projects require an additional layer of accountability and reporting to ensure project success. TU-CGIS is involved with the MAA project and is learning how large GIS / IT projects should be coordinated with DBM. A MITDP is any information technology development project that meets one or more of the following criteria:
  - The estimated total cost of development equals or exceeds \$1 million;

- The project is undertaken to support a critical business function associated with the public health, education, safety or financial well-being of the citizens of Maryland; or
  - The Secretary of the Department of Budget and Management determines that the project requires the special attention and consideration given to a major IT development project due to: the significance of the project's potential benefits or risks; the impact of the project on the public or local governments; the public visibility of the project; or other reasons as determined by the Secretary.
- d) Statewide CAD Integration: Matt Felton discussed the MEMA/TU-CGIS EMMA computer aided dispatch project. As an example of GIS Coordination, the project illustrates the convergence of 911, county data, MEMA, and the GIS component. Rich Leadbeater asked why MEMA wished to have this particular application. Matt Felton responded that in the event of a major emergency incident, the application provides a synoptic view of the resources that are available, along with other information of statewide significance.
- e) Data Sharing Partnership for *The National Map*: Matt Felton recently broadcast a letter of invitation with the MOU to share data via TU-CGIS to *The National Map*. He requested feedback from counties; at this time we have received a completed MOU from Cecil County only. The committee noted that county executives must put several projects on hold until after the January gubernatorial inauguration.
- f) The USGS/FGDC/NSDI cooperative agreement RFP has been issued and is available at <http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=1583>.
- g) Matt Felton reserved a booth for GIS Coordination at the MACo winter conference. Information about the conference is available at [http://www.mdcountries.org/events/wc\\_overview.cfm](http://www.mdcountries.org/events/wc_overview.cfm).
- h) The HSIP Gold Database: Matt Felton received a phone call from a vendor who asked if Maryland is interested in sharing data and receiving data in return. For example, HSIP would receive Maryland's fire or police station data, verify the data, then return a useable database to Maryland. We are likely to participate in the program although uncertain of the timing and level of resources that can be allocated. Warren Campbell stated that he is familiar with HSIP. He also noted that The National Guard has the HSIP Gold database. Since Maryland is part of the National Guard, Maryland also should have the program, but this is not the case. Rich Leadbeater stated that the project was problematic during Hurricane Katrina due to the way the database was constructed. Matt Felton stated that the current iteration is likely to be different. Rich Leadbeater further stated that HSIP has no update plan and no continuation of the data source.

## 2. ITAC Meeting

Matt Felton requested input from the committee on appropriate topics to present. Suggestions include GIS 101, description of specific activities we are engaged in; previous PowerPoint presentations prepared for this committee and as outreach; description of the existing data and technology and the variety of ways they can be used. Bruce Eikenberg suggested that the presentation include plenty of visuals.

### 3. GIS Executive Council and GIS Advisory Board Membership

What should the GIS Executive Council and the Advisory Board look like? Using the SIEC Governance example, the committee discussed possible sources of membership. Ken Miller and Rich Leadbeater suggested MACo and MML as the most logical sources for a broad range of influence and expertise. Additionally, the timing is right to reach MACo and MML members because they are realizing the value of GIS, and they are well familiar with the SIEC structure. Ken Miller asked if the SIEC membership is still active and enthusiastic. Warren Campbell replied that the work of the committee is spread among an adequate number of members, and that the subcommittees each comprise different members. All subcommittee membership comes from the 21-member committee. The committee is funded from the top down, whereas GIS Coordination will likely be funded from individual agency budgets.

Virginia Peterman suggested that we include a key non-government member, such as a utilities, and/or a federal government representative. Charlene Howard asked if there is enough GIS at small municipalities for membership. The consensus is that municipalities are finding more need for GIS and are leaning on larger agencies for the services. Ken Miller stated that municipalities need a voice at the steering committee level, as does the federal government, although it is desirable to not make the membership too large.

### 4. Funding

Matt Felton discussed pages 4 and 5 of the agenda/handout. Page 5 features a data list that was prompted by work with MEMA on EMMA. Relative to funding, the consensus of the committee is that \$250,000 is too low, and that a more realistic startup cost would be between \$300,000 and \$500,000. The suggestion was made to add 10% of the TU-CGIS salary burden to the initial estimate. Virginia Peterman commented that the GIO position is a traveling, networking, coordinating position that requires a substantial budget for travel and conference attendance. Marshall Stevenson suggested calculating realistic estimates for each component of GIS Coordination. Matt Felton proposed calculating a budget for a several-year period and averaging the amount. Rich Leadbeater suggested considering where Maryland wants to be in five years. A number of examples were suggested, such as the ITEAM model (12 staff, \$6million budget, approximately 50% of cost was for data).

Relative to funding strategies listed on page 6 of the agenda/handout, Bruce Eikenberg stated that Maryland imposes special restrictions and conditions on funding sources.

5. Ellis Kitchen, Chief of Information Technology, Office of Information Technology for the State of Maryland, supports GIS Coordination for Maryland and is serving as the executive sponsor. He sees the current situation as comprising 6-7 major government consumers of GIS in Maryland, 1 primary provider (TU-CGIS), and no existing coordination. He attended the meeting to present a comprehensive suggestion for funding GIS Coordination based on the Network Maryland model and experience. He considers the model to be the least risky, most efficient, and most promising funding method.

The traditional method of project funding, i.e., to work through the state budget process, was deemed impractical for major IT projects. The state has 40 IT projects that are funded and underway at \$400million. In FY 2008, 40 more projects will be funded at \$200million. There is a 1 in 4 chance of a project's being funded via the traditional budget process. By viewing the technology as a service rather than a project, the service can be supported with user-based fees, which is how Network Maryland is supported. In other words, "Provide the service agencies want at a price they think is reasonable."

After explaining the structure of Network Maryland (hereafter NM), Mr. Kitchen entertained questions and discussion.

*Comment/question:* Relative to cost, GIS does not fit exactly into the service category, and is very labor intensive.

*Response:* The lead organization must accurately capture the costs and pro-rate them into the fees.

*Comment/question:* What was the critical point at which NM was deemed official?

*Response:* Legislation mandated that 80% of Maryland's agencies had to use NM by 2006. Initially, agencies did not trust that NM would work, so they wished to be included in the 20% non-compliant group. NM had to operate as a business; customers were invited to serve on the NM board. By word-of-mouth, NM soon became overwhelmed with demand.

*Comment/question:* Where does the startup capital come from?

*Response:* From the Treasury, at 5 ¼% interest. The originating agency must produce a good business case.

*Comment/question:* Does part of the NM cost include DBM costs? (NM is housed at DBM.)

*Response:* Yes.

*Comment/question:* Does NM include non-government participation?

*Response:* No, because NM works in direct competition with private industry.

*Comment/question:* How will we get agencies that already have GIS services, and in some cases, already contract with TU-CGIS for services, to participate?

*Response:* GIS services could be offered similarly to the current set-up. For example, IT is market-place driven, so IT services must be "sold."

*Comment/question:* Would we want legislation to mandate GIS use?

*Response:* Only as an alternative if agencies refuse to buy into the service-market-sales model.

*Comment/question:* Does NM have dedicated staff?

*Response:* Yes.

*Advice:* Plan/create a business case. Invite 24 customers to serve on the board. Discover the products they want. Design the network. Capital project funding is seed money. Create a capital project, establish a lead agency, create the coordinator position, establish the board, then sell the services and collect the fees. The capital (versus budget) user option is more manageable than depending on grants and funding from other agencies.

*Comment/question:* Can excess monies be spent on other things?

*Response:* Yes; for example, the lead agency offering the GIS services can put excess money back into GIS. Additionally, agencies that are saving money by buying the services can use their savings for other purposes.

*Comment/question:* How is staffing managed?

*Response:* MSDI staff should be assigned only to MSDI work. At this time, there are about 12 full-time GIS staff in Maryland agencies. If the agencies purchase services from MSDI, then the possibility exists that their GIS staff must be assigned other work in addition to GIS work. Current status of GIS staff and work in Maryland agencies should be evaluated for duplication of effort, since GIS coordination is intended to eliminate duplication of effort.

Discussion occurred relative to whether or not data should be sold, which presents a variety of problems. Generally, the data are in the public domain. Access to the data can be sold, and applications that use the data can be sold. For example, if the orthoimagery acquisition project is funded by partnerships, the data will be in the public domain, and fees will be assessed for access to the data.

6. The next meeting will take place on Monday, December 18 from 1-3 p.m. in the Administration Building, room 120.

Recording: Susan Wooden

---

Signature

Date December 5, 2006

Reviewed: Matt Felton



---

Signature

Date December 6, 2006