

*Interim Project Report - NSDI CAP Grant Category 5*  
**MetroGIS Quantify Public Value Study**  
*Reporting Period: October 1 to December 31, 2010*

**Report Date:** January 10, 2011

**Agreement Number:** G10AC00239

**Project Title:** Measuring Public Value of Geospatial Commons: A MetroGIS Case Study

**Organization:** Metropolitan Council

390 Robert Street North

St. Paul, Mn 55101

<http://www.metrocouncil.org/about/index.htm>

**Principal Investigators:** Randall Johnson, 651-602-1638, [randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us)

Francis Harvey, 612-229-7707, [fharvey@umn.edu](mailto:fharvey@umn.edu)

**Listing of Collaborating Organizations:**

**1000 Friends of Minnesota**

c/o Sally Wakefield

651-312-1000, ext 207

[www.1000fom.org/contact](http://www.1000fom.org/contact):

**Hennepin County**

c/o Gary Swenson

(612) 543-0797

[www.co.hennepin.mn.us](http://www.co.hennepin.mn.us)

**MetroGIS**

c/o Randall Johnson

651-602-1638

[www.metrogis.org](http://www.metrogis.org)

**Metropolitan Council**

c/o Rick Gelbmann

651-602-1371

[www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org)

**Executive Summary** (216 words)

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, that which 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.

A test interview with a user of parcel data produced by Hennepin County is tentatively scheduled for February 2011. The results of the test will be used to refine the study methodology. A time frame for the remainder of the study will be set thereafter. Project completion is anticipated in fall 2011.

## **Project Narrative**

The focus during this reporting period has been on modifying the QPV Study scope to move forward following a finding that the required GITA ROI methodology is not appropriate for our objectives. No grant eligible expenses were paid this reporting period. Total grant eligible expenses paid to date remain at \$19,129.73, or 38.2 percent of the \$50,000 grant awarded to the project. Our In-Kind contribution increased \$7,304.90 this quarter for a total of \$42,961.74 or \$3,711.74 (109.4 percent) more than our \$39,250 pledged obligation. (See Attachment 1 for a copy of Form 425.)

Major outcomes accomplished during this reporting period included:

### **Administrative:**

- a) Prepared and submitted 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Project Report in October 2010.
- b) Updated public facing project [website](#).
- c) Maintained a database for tracking in-kind time contributions.
- d) Set up protocols for reimbursement of expenses by scientific advisors to ensure standardized reporting and clarity on expectations. (The reporting form is available upon request.)
- e) Initiated conversations with GITA leadership to understand issues encountered with our attempt to use their ROI methodology and communicate these matters to the FDGC to ensure others do not experience the same issues.
- f) Secured endorsement from Milo Robinson to radically revise the scope of the awarded project.

### **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 is 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):**

The objective of Task 2 was radically affected when our team realized that the GITA ROI methodology is not appropriate for our objectives. Instead of being able to leverage the results of applying a defined methodology to Hennepin County’s situation in Task 1, as had been originally proposed, suddenly there was no model upon which to build the outward looking QPV component of our study – a principal driver for proposing this study. Consequently, in large part, our focus during this reporting period involved discussions with GITA and FGDC leadership and our international scientific advisor team to investigate options for defining an alternate path forward. Key accomplishments this reporting period:

- a) Through an extensive outreach effort, completed compilation of a listing of interview candidates for Task 3.
- b) On October 8<sup>th</sup>, the QPV Study Team met via conference call with GITA leadership and the authors of the subject GITA ROI methodology. The study team explained issues that had arisen applying the GITA ROI methodology to measure value to Hennepin County created from geo-enabling parcel data production and management. GITA officials acknowledged their methodology is not appropriate to our study objectives. They also provided substantive advice for moving forward with a revised methodology. We also discussed the need to speak with FGDC officials to ensure that future grant applications do not run in to the same issues.

- c) On December 1<sup>st</sup>, Francis Harvey, QPV Study Research Coordinator, facilitated the originally proposed Webinar involving several international experts in the operation of Spatial Data Infrastructures (SDI) but the focus was radically different than originally anticipated. Instead, of seeking constructive criticism from these experts on refinements to the GITA ROI to better address our needs, the focus was on identifying a new path forward. None was aware of an existing model that meets our needs so advice was sought on the prospect of developing a model from scratch.

The participants were each asked to submit written comments prior to the Webinar to questions posed by Francis Harvey. The comments that were submitted were compiled and forwarded to each participant to review prior to the Webinar. A summary of the Webinar is available upon request. Each advisor who submitted written comments is eligible for up to a \$400 stipend that will be paid from grant funds upon request during winter 2011. These payments were proposed in the original project budget and authorized with the initial grant award.

- d) On December 8<sup>th</sup>, Randall Johnson, QPV Administrative Coordinator, met with Milo Robinson, NSDI Grant coordinator, to seek formal endorsement of continuing this study but with radical changes to budget and scope that had been approved with the grant award. Mr. Robinson graciously approved the following guidelines for revising the original scope:
- 1) No grant funds, in addition to the previously authorized \$50,000, are available from the FDGC.
  - 2) A time extension of up to 12 months (from April 2011), depending upon our anticipated needs, will be authorized.
  - 3) Our Task 3 deliverable remains a primary objective but substantial changes to the original study plan and budget are permissible, as our team deems appropriate, to accomplish this outcome (e.g., changing the Task 4 forum from on-site in the Twin Cities to an Webinar and reallocating the Task 4 forum funds to Task 3).
  - 4) If our team determines that additional skills/resources are needed to effectively carry out the revised project plan:
    - a) The project may be postponed while these required skills/resources are being secured. This process may include publishing a RFP.
    - b) If our team determines that insufficient funding is available to effectively accomplish the Task 3 deliverable, we may cease the study with no further obligation with the understanding that the situation is first discussed with the FGDC grant administrator before a final decision is made.
  - 5) If a 2011 Category 5 Grant proposal seeks a similar objective, we may seek out a collaborative partnership with the sponsors.
  - 6) There is no obligation to revisit the incomplete Task 1 deliverable using a new methodology. The results, as described in the 3rd Quarter Project Report, satisfy our obligation.

With these rescoping guidelines now in place, the study team is working to develop a revised Task 3 methodology.

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

The high-level method for the Outward Looking QPV Study Component remains the same as originally conceived.

That is, interview individuals who represent academic, non-profits/neighborhood advocacy organizations, for-profit, first responders, and utility interests, as well as, other government 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.

However, the interview questions and means to capture and analyze the meaning of the interview results need to be developed from scratch. Consequently, to continue this important work, the above-referenced scope changes were necessitated and a project time extension is required to accommodate substantially later completion targets for Tasks 2 and 3 than originally anticipated.

At the time of this writing, a meeting of the Local Project Advisory Team (as opposed to the International Team) was scheduled for January 27, 2011. A proposed revised scope will be shared with the team for comment. If the revised scope is endorsed, a test interview is tentatively scheduled for February 8-9. Following any refinements following the test interview, a revised scope and accompanying milestones for Task 3 and the remainder of the study will be shared with the FGDC grant administrator for acceptance, in accordance with the understanding reached with Milo Robinson on December 8, 2010 and described above.

**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 1**

**Standard Form 425**

*(Reporting Period: October 1 to December 31, 2010)*

*(See Next Page)*

# FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORT

(Follow form instructions)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted <b>United States Geology Survey</b>		2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned by Federal Agency (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)  <b>G10AC00239</b>			Page	1	of	1
pages								
3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including Zip code) <b>Metropolitan Council 390 Robert Street North, St. Paul, MN 55101</b>								
4a. DUNS Number <b>'0300185760001</b>		4b. EIN <b>416008898</b>		5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment) <b>A3335P1</b>		6. Report Type <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quarterly <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-Annual <input type="checkbox"/> Annual <input type="checkbox"/> Final		7. Basis of Accounting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cash <input type="checkbox"/> Accrual
8. Project/Grant Period From: (Month, Day, Year) <b>04/30/10</b>				To: (Month, Day, Year) <b>04/29/11</b>		9. Reporting Period End Date (Month, Day, Year) <b>'12/31/2010</b>		
10. Transactions							<b>Cumulative</b>	
<i>(Use lines a-c for single or multiple grant reporting)</i>								
<b>Federal Cash (To report multiple grants, also use FFR Attachment):</b>								
a. Cash Receipts				\$19,129.93 previously reported + \$0.00 this report			\$19,129.93	
b. Cash Disbursements							\$19,129.93	
c. Cash on Hand (line a minus b)							\$0.00	
<i>(Use lines d-o for single grant reporting)</i>								
<b>Federal Expenditures and Unobligated Balance:</b>								
d. Total Federal funds authorized							\$50,000.00	
e. Federal share of expenditures				\$19,129.93 previously reported + \$0.00 this report			\$19,129.93	
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations							\$0.00	
g. Total Federal share (sum of lines e and f)							\$19,129.73	
h. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (line d minus g)							\$30,870.27	
<b>Recipient Share:</b>								
i. Total recipient share required				<b>In-Kind Contributions</b>			\$39,250.00	
j. Recipient share of expenditures				\$35,656.84 declared last report + new \$7,304.90 (4th quarter)			\$42,961.74	
k. Remaining recipient share to be provided (line i minus j)				<b>Beyond Amount Pledged</b>			(\$3,711.74)	
<b>Program Income:</b>								
l. Total Federal 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	Period To	d. Base	e. Amount Charged	f. Federal Share
						g. Totals:		
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						c. Telephone (Area code, number and extension) 651-602-1436		
						d. Email address <a href="mailto:Mercy.Ndungu@metc.state.mn.us">Mercy.Ndungu@metc.state.mn.us</a>		
b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official						e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year) Created 10/04/2010		
14. Agency use only:								

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.