

Date: 9/30/2010

Agreement Number: G09AC00094

Project title: Category 7: Demonstration of Geospatial Data Partnerships across Local, State and Federal Government: Eastern Missouri Collaborative Review and Maintenance of Tier 1 and Locally Critical Structures

Final report:

A no-cost extension was granted 3/30/2010 to extend the project period until 6/30/2010 – this extension provided additional time for data point location review and attributing by the local government partner.

Organization: Missouri Spatial Data Information Service, Rm. 8, Stewart Hall, Columbia, MO, 65212, www.msdis.missouri.edu

Principal Investigator: Mark E. Duewell, (573) 882-6734, duewellm@missouri.edu

Collaborating Organizations:

Mr. Steve Etcher, (636) 456-3473, etcher@boonslick.org
Executive Director, Boonslick Regional Planning Commission (Boonslick)
111 Steinhagen, Warrenton, MO, 63383

Mr. Chauncy Buchheit, (573) 547-8357, cbuchheit@semorpc.org
Director, Missouri Association of Councils of Government (MACOG), Executive Director, Southeast Missouri Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission (SEMORPEDC)
1 West St Joseph St. P.O. Box 366, Perryville, MO, 63775

Mr. Tim Haithcoat, (573)882-2324, Tim.Haithcoat@oa.mo.gov
Missouri Geographic Information Officer
Rm. 104, Stewart Hall, Columbia, MO, 65212

USGS Geospatial (State) Liaison: Mr. Raymond Fox, (573) 308-3744, rfox@usgs.gov USGS Geospatial Liaison to Missouri

Data themes: Structures, Re-aligned Roads, Local Critical Infrastructure

Executive Summary:

The Eastern Missouri Collaborative Review and Maintenance of Tier 1 and Locally Critical Structures demonstrated the value of cultured geospatial data partnerships across local, state and federal entities. The project provided the impetus to creating or enhancing numerous partnerships between all three levels of government, most significantly at the regional and local level. In a region that has historically had limited geospatial data cooperation new sharing

agreements were actualized and a remarkable sense of “team” achieved. One of the deliverables has not yet to be completed – a structures layer to the Boonslick RPC for review and future enhancements. See below in section b of the project narrative for details on how that issue is being addressed.

Project Narrative:

- a. The project experienced some delays noted in the mid-project interim report and in paragraph d. below. The revised project scope required funding shift. A sub-contract based on the project scope was executed with our local government partner – Boonslick RPC and is on file here at the University of Missouri. Data collected will be available in the public domain in Geospatial One Stop (GOS) (where appropriate) and via The National Map after the data is reviewed and sensitive information removed. We’re not anticipating too much work to accomplish this.
- b. The data layers that are still building (All Structures layer and a Road Re-alignment Layer) are very near completion. This delay is due to a technical staff lead position turning over twice during the project period. The latest technical staff member tasked with completing this project accepted a position with a local county government, and agreed to continue work on this data layer in a consulting capacity. As with previous partnership efforts a subset of data provided from third party federal Homeland Security sources was reviewed by the RPC. This review started on or about October 15th in the Boonslick RPC (3 counties, Warren, Lincoln and Montgomery).
- c. The data will be updated annually. Previous local government partners have settled into the annual review and delivery schedule quite readily. Procedures utilized for all data maintained in the Missouri Spatial Data Information Service (MSDIS), the state clearinghouse will insure that the project’s data will be updated and integrated into *The National Map*.
- d. As stated in the interim report a scramble for additional funding occurred after an emergency shift in projected State Homeland Security funding impacted the state’s geospatial funding. Funding became limited to pay student interns to complete the data collection, resulting in a delay of about six weeks until additional funding from the MSDIS budget was detailed to support further collection.
- e. The communication task of presenting at the NSGIC or URISA annual meetings was completed at the 2010 NSGIC and 2010 URISA meetings by Mr. Tim Haithcoat, Missouri Geographic Information Officer and MSDIS Director. We also anticipate being able to present at the upcoming 2011 Missouri GIS Conference.
- f. The final challenge of the reluctant nature of one of the 5 counties to provide address point locations was addressed via a workaround. Mr. Jason Schantz - the RPC technical contact for the project was able to secure the data from other sources within the county.
- g. Mr. Ray Fox - our Missouri USGS liaison – was most helpful throughout the project. He offered this help frequently and was mostly utilized in a review capacity. Mr. Fox’s opinion is highly valued and his long experience in this discipline pays dividends in our numerous contacts with him. We requested a shift in funding to pay our local government partners an additional \$4000 due to the wider extent of the targeted area – documentation was provided and sent through the appropriate channels – and duly approved.
- h. A formal ongoing agreement is in place to provide data to *The National Map*.

- i. A follow-on activity for the region currently being planned is an updated metadata workshop which will be unfortunately delayed by other projects to the spring of 2011. Please see the attached copy of sub-contractor agreement.
- j. Conclusion: The project continued a string of successes in forming relationships with local governments. It encouraged them to become data stewards of regional data and providing that data to the state with annual updates. The locals partners (Boonslick RPC) were particularly effective in securing data about local attractions and churches – data that is often difficult to collect effectively from remote locations. A number of federal data sets can benefit from the collection, review and maintenance of these data. Regarding accuracy and completeness these data sets can be represented as the best existing data for their regions. Most importantly this project provided impetus for regional staff to broker powerful data exchange relationships with their local counties and municipalities. Missouri is committed to continuing these “Structures” projects as long as resources can be found to do so.

We believe that Missouri must continue to explore methodologies that lead to ongoing maintenance and review of regional data by locals utilizing the data on a day-to-day basis. “Crowd sourcing” seems to be providing some new opportunities in this direction and may eventually offer a viable solution. However, it would be useful to continue to pursue partnerships with local governments that result in the regular sharing of data through mutually beneficial projects.

Feedback on Cooperative Agreements Program

What are the program strengths and weaknesses?

Strengths: The program is often the only source of funding for such activities – even when it isn't the only source it's often more accessible and user friendly than some other granting agencies.

Weaknesses: It's weakness is also its strength – the CAP changes each year to address the nation's geospatial agenda – but as a moving target it's best not to keep a currently viable project in your pocket - hoping for an opportunity next year - because there may not be one.

Where does the program make a difference?

Sometimes its format and potential projects help set the agenda here in Missouri – at least for the Missouri Spatial Data Information Service.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?

Very – we were pleased on all levels on that account.

What would you recommend doing differently?

In such challenging fiscal times – nothing. However some projects are difficult to get off the ground on the funding available. Not all – or even most – by any means.

Are there factors that are missing or additional needs that should be considered?

Again – funding constraints aside – your primary concerns with available funding seem to be at the national and state level. But there are so many people below that level that could contribute to that your mission (and sometimes do). Your most effective method of working with these players is your liaison program. So any funding that can be distributed through that program that goes beyond our (state) level and gets to the mover's and the shakers at mid and lower government levels helps us all out.

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed? Timeframe?

None currently come to mind.

If you were to do this again, what would you do differently?

More planning prep within our agency – because we had done this once before we thought we had a template. Inevitably staff turnover caught up with us although – admittedly – twice in one year for a single position is hopefully an anomaly. So doubling up on technical skills and participation inside the database would be a good recommendation.