Executive Summary (165 words. Revised from the original submittal)
This study proposes development of a methodology capable of quantitatively measuring public value (QPV) created when organizations actively participate in a geospatial commons. The territorial focus is Hennepin County, Minnesota; the 32nd largest county in the United States by population, and the local government jurisdictions within it. The study involves interviewing representatives of all forms of government, non-profit, utility, industry, and academic interests serving the seven-county, Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area - the MetroGIS community.

Understanding public value created, when public producers of geospatial data openly share their data, is a key issue in discussions surrounding spatial data infrastructure (SDI) development and continued support. The scope of this prototyping effort has been limited to parcel data (spatial and tabular), in particular, parcel data that adheres to standards that support interoperability. The proposed QPV methodology, which is to be developed as a component of the study, will attempt to account for public benefit created through reuse and chaining of parcel data by others who use these data.

Project Narrative
Our focus during this reporting period has been on regrouping and defining a QPV Study methodology from scratch. This regrouping process began in earnest in December 2010. As reported in our two previous project status reports, this regrouping was necessitated following the September 2010 finding that the originally required GITA ROI methodology is not appropriate for our objectives.

Notwithstanding the significant setbacks encountered to date, the positive side of our work this past quarter is that our team has had the opportunity to coalesce, rethink the objectives, and reach
agreement on a revised methodology. We believe that the new approach will better provide the information needed by policy makers to effectively assess the value that can be realized by placing parcel data into the public domain versus revenue received with current access policies.

No grant-eligible expenses were encumbered this reporting period. However, due to the unexpected delays encountered last quarter to set accounting protocols under the new federal ASAP system, the attached Form 425 for this quarter shows an expenditure of $4,831.53 for a total of 23,951.26 in grant-eligible funds spent to date or 47.9 percent of the $50,000 grant awarded to the project.

On March 24th, along with authorization of a project completion time extension to April 29, 2012, FGDC grant administrators also authorized stopping our tracking of in-kind contributions, given that our pledged obligation was exceeded in March. At that time of the time extension request, we had documented a total of $54,808.74 or $15,558.74 (139.6 percent) more than our $39,250 pledged in-kind obligation. The need to redesign our methodology from scratch was, in large part, the reason for the higher in-kind support expenses than originally anticipated.

Major outcomes accomplished during this reporting period included:

**Administrative:**

a) Coordinated with the Council’s Finance Office and federal staff to set up protocol for a new federal ASAP grant funding processing system. This process took in excess of 6 weeks to complete, during which time we could not process payments for services provided in February.

b) Coordinated with the Council’s Finance Unit to finalize payments for grant-eligible services incurred in February, totaling $4,831.53, which were delayed due to unexpected delays setting up protocols to draw again our grant funds via the federal ASAP system.

c) Coordinated with FGDC staff and the Council’s Procurement/Contracts Unit to execute a formal contract amendment to extend our project completion deadline to April 29, 2012. This amendment was authorized by FGDC grant administration staff on March 24, 2011 and was formally put in place on April 28, 2011.


e) Updated the public facing project website.

f) The QPV Study Administrative Coordinator, with input from the QPV Study Research Coordinator, developed the “Defining Values” Request for Proposals (see Task 2 below) and published it with assistance from the Council’s Contracts Unit.

**Project - Task 1 - Measure Benefit to Hennepin County of Geo-Enabling Parcel Data (Complete):**

The results were not what we expected – the GITA ROI methodology required to be used as a condition of grant funding was found to be not appropriate for our study objectives. (See the July to September 2010 Quarterly Project Report for the issues encountered).

**Project - Task 2 – Define “Outward Looking” QPV Methodology (In progress):**

On April 25th the QPV Study Advisory Team agreed on design objectives and general methodology for a radically revised Task 3, following investigation of multiple options. The Team considered several options, but ultimately selected a design that focuses on policy makers and values important

---

1 Pursuant to permission received from the FGDC grant administrators, we ceased tracking in-kind contributions in March. At that time, we had contributed in excess of 1.5 times that of our total in-kind contribution commitment.
to them in their leadership of their respective institutions, as opposed to programs managers and technicians who utilize parcel data to support decision-making.

The objective of the revised design, entitled “Defining Values Component”, seeks to define values important to policy makers that, if met, would provide sufficient public value creation to justify placing parcel data into the public domain. The previous design involved interviews to define uses of parcel data that the users believe are capable of creating public value.

As with our original study design, the new design also requires supplemental support resources but process and deliverable differs significantly from the design that was to have supplemented the GITA ROI methodology. Notwithstanding the problems encountered with the GITA ROI methodology, the QPV Study Advisory Team believes that directly involving the policy maker, as currently proposed, is a better fit to accomplish the original study objective #8 stating:

“The results generated by the desired QPV methodology must be structured in such a way that local government policy makers can readily compare and contrast them to the costs of supporting their operations with and without participating in a geospatial commons”.

Although the newly conceived study method differs substantially from that described in our grant application, the objective for the Outward Looking QPV Study Component remains the same as originally conceived and explained for our awarded project. The new design involves facilitating a series of focus groups, comprised of policy makers from the same interests as previously targeted variety of public, private, non-profit and utility interests that serve the geographic extent of Hennepin County and:

a) Whose operations do/could benefit from access to parcel data produced by Hennepin County.

AND

b) Who believe their value added data/web service/application(s) do/could improve the cost-effectiveness of:

(1) Hennepin County operations.

AND/OR

(2) Operations of one or more taxing jurisdictions that serve Hennepin County’s citizens.

A Request for Proposals (RFP), to secure the needed supplemental support resource, was published on June 3. The refined Task 3 study objectives are outlined in the RFP. July 15 is the response deadline.

**Project-Task 3– Implement “Outward Looking” QPV Methodology (Pending):**

Assuming that at least one qualified proposal is received in response the Defining Values RFP, our expectation is that the study will resume in August 2011. Francis Harvey, QPV Study Research Coordinator, has an obligation in Europe from mid-May through early August.

**Other information requested in / for the interim project report:**

1. Draft ROI Case study and related documents - Premature

2. Photographs, graphics, or illustrations) - Premature or not possible to provide at this time.
ATTACHMENT A

Standard Federal Form 425
(Reporting Period: April 1 to June 30, 2011)

(See Next Page)
1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted
   United States Geology Survey

2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned by Federal Agency
   (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)
   G10AC00239

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including Zip code)
   Metropolitan Council
   390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101

4a. DUNS Number
   0300185760001

4b. EIN
   416008898

5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number
   (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)
   A3335P1

6. Report Type
   X☐ Cash □ Accrual

7. Basis of Accounting
   □ Semi-Annual □ Annual

8. Project/Grant Period
   From: (Month, Day, Year) 04/30/10
   To: (Month, Day, Year) 04/29/12

9. Reporting Period End Date
   (Month, Day, Year) 6/30/2011

10. Transactions
    Cumulative

    (Use lines a-c for single or multiple grant reporting)

    Federal Cash (To report multiple grants, also use FFR Attachment):
    a. Cash Receipts  $19,129.93 previously reported + $4,831.53 disbursed this period
       $23,961.53
    b. Cash Disbursements -
       $23,961.53
    c. Cash on Hand (line a minus b)
       $0.00

    (Use lines d-o for single grant reporting)

    Federal Expenditures and Unobligated Balance:
    d. Total Federal funds authorized
       $50,000.00
    e. Federal share of expenditures
       $23,961.53
    f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations
       $0.00
    g. Total Federal share (sum of lines e and f)
       $23,961.46
    h. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (line d minus g)
       $26,038.54

    Recipient Share:
    i. Total recipient share required
       In-Kind Contributions
       $39,250.00
    j. Recipient share of expenditures (As of March 24, 2011, no longer required to track because exceed obligation)
       $54,808.40
    k. Remaining recipient share to be provided (line i minus j)
       Beyond Amount Pledged
       ($15,558.40)

    Program Income:
    l. Program income earned
       $0.00
    m. Program income expended in accordance with the deduction alternative
       $0.00
    n. Program income expended in accordance with the addition alternative
       $0.00
    o. Unexpended program income (line l minus line m or line n)
       $0.00

11. Indirect Expense
    a. Type
    b. Rate
    c. Period From
    d. Period To
    e. Base
    f. Amount Charged
    g. Federal Share

12. Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation:

13. Certification: By signing this report, I certify that it is true, complete, and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

   a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official
      Mercy Ndungu
      Financial Analyst - Treasury
   b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

14. Agency use only:

   Created 07/1/2011
   Standard Form 425
   OMB Approval Number: 0348-0061
   Expiration Date: 10/31/2011

Paperwork Burden Statement
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act, as amended, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB Control Number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0348-0061. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0061), Washington, DC 20503.