

Date: January 30, 2012

Agreement Number: G11AC20064

Project title: Statewide Cadastral Layer Business Plan for West Virginia

Applicant organization: Marshall University Research Corporation obo Nick. J Rahall II
Appalachian Transportation Institute at Marshall University (RTI) <http://www.njrati.org/>
PO Box 5425
Huntington, WV 25703-0425

Principal Investigator: Dr. Diana Long, Director of Workforce Development. 304.542.3303
dlong@njrati.org

Collaborating Organizations

Craig, Neidig, Geospatial Liaison
United States Geological Survey
Eastern Region NSDI Partnership
Office
Charleston, WV 25301

Tony Simental, State GIS
Coordinator
WV Office of GIS Coordination
1124 Smith Street, Suite LM-10
Charleston, WV, 25301

Rob Shaffer, President
WV Association of Geospatial
Professionals
PO Box 3903
Charleston, WV 25339

Rose Ann Maine
President WV Assessors Association
150 Armstrong St
Keyser, WV

Jeff Amburgey
WV Property Tax Division
1124 Smith St. Suite 211
Charleston, WV 25301

Kurt Donaldson, GIS Manager
WV GIS Technical Center
West Virginia University

330 Brooks Hall
Morgantown, WV 26506

Paula Langley, Land Records
Specialist
Bureau of Land Management
Milwaukee Field Office
626 E. Wisconsin Ave., Suite 200
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53

Executive Summary

Project Narrative

Summary of project activities

1. Workshops Statewide workshops were held to discuss and reach agreement on the WV Cadastral Data Business Plan. Each workshop was planned with a focused topic of discussion. Results of each workshop was posted on the website as well as schedules and announcements: <https://sites.google.com/site/wvgisbusinessplan/courses>

Workshop 1 - The Kick off 3/24/2011, Charleston, WV. Topic: Inform participants on the overall purpose of this project i.e., to reach agreement among WV GIS stakeholders on a Business Plan. Participants: 49

Workshop 2 - Data Collection 4/21/2011, South Charleston, WV. Topic: Cadastral data collection and the collection issues the business plan will need to address. Participants: 39

Workshop 3 - Data Conversion 5/20/11, Flatwoods, WV. Topic: Cadastral data conversion and the conversion issues the business plan will need to address. Participants: 24

Workshop 4 - Data Maintenance 6/13/2011, Held in conjunction with the WV GIS Conference, Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Topic: Cadastral data maintenance and the maintenance issues the business plan will need to address. Participants: 24

Workshop 5 - Data Publishing 7/14/2011, Institute, WV. Topic: Cadastral data publishing and the publishing issues the business plan will need to address. Participants: 24

Workshop 6 - Data Integration 8/11/2011, Institute, WV, and Topic: Cadastral data integration and the integration issues the business plan will need to address. Participants: 17

2. Attended NSGIC meeting, Maryland
3. Attended NSGIS meeting, Idaho
4. Draft of plan titled *Statewide Land Information System Business Plan* was presented to the Rahall Transportation Institute staff on November 15, 2011. Schedule going forward was outlined during this session as well.
5. Draft of SLIS business plan was emailed to steering committee members and all of the participants who attended one or more of the workshops.

6. The draft SLIS business plan was reviewed by various stakeholders between October and December 2011. Tony Simental, Director of the WV Office of GIS Coordination visited Assessors and Regional Planning Councils following locations in WV.

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| October 19, 2011 | Webster County and Region 4 |
| October 20, 2011 | Grant County |
| October 24, 2011 | Monongalia and Marion Counties |
| October 25, 2011 | Hampshire County |
| October 27, 2011 | Region 1 |
| November 1, 2011 | Wood County Region 5 |
| November 4, 2011 | Region 2 |
| November 14, 2011 | Region 9 and Jefferson County |
| November 30, 2011 | Presentation to Geospatial Professionals |
| December 7, 2011 | Region 6 |
| December 8, 2011 | Region 3 |
| December 12, 2011 | Region |
| December 14, 2011 | Region 11 |
| January 22-24, 2012 | Exhibit at the Association of County Commissioners |

7. The SLIS business plan was presented to the Property Valuation Committee on January 4, 2012.
8. The SLIS business plan was reviewed by the GIS Policy Council on January 6, 2012. The council suggested minor edits and are scheduled to meet on February 3, 2012.

Key accomplishments to date

1. Establishment of website <https://sites.google.com/site/wvgisbusinessplan/home>
2. Completion of workshops as proposed.
3. Compilation of contact information of attendees.
4. Completion of the Statewide Land Information System Business Plan.

Inclusive efforts

Announcements and invitations were sent to over 150 individuals and organizations. 177 individuals total attended one or more workshops. The number of participants at each workshop ranged from a high of 49 and a low of 17. The majority of the participants were County Assessors or their representatives. 11 of the participants were from private industry. Participants were urged to spread the word and invite other stakeholders.

Assessors, State agencies and surveyors showed the most interest in being involved in the process of developing the business plan. Special efforts were made to include realtors, railroads and oil and gas companies. The realtors were not sure why they should have an interest in the data; the railroads believed they had all the information they needed. Oil and gas representatives attended the first session and expressed support, but did not feel they needed to be involved in

the process of deciding on the business plan. Plain speaking, they seemed to say, “Let us know when you are done”.

Once the SLIC business plan was approved, it was emailed to a wider group of stakeholders including: Private industry groups who expressed an interest in the project, but did not attend the workshops;

How statewide coordination has changed as a result of this project

Before this project, County Assessors operated in isolated silos, with little or no communication with each other or state GIS professionals. The workshops introduced the Assessors to each other and facilitated networking among the group. The participating stakeholders were not aware of data which was available. They now use a List serve which connects the Assessors to the GIS world. As stated in the LIS business plan, “Building the statewide LIS will require communication between stakeholders that do not always get a chance to talk to each other. At the local government level alone, the assessment, planning and emergency people are usually different groups. For the person responsible for the parcel transaction to know how important a particular piece of information is in an emergency can make a big difference. The biggest benefit may be the understanding of how many stakeholders are impacted by a parcel data change.”

Practices or activities which lead to success

1. The number one practice which led to the success of the project was the skill of the facilitator. Rob Godbey, a professional facilitator did not have a bias or a personal agenda, but he did have a science and technology background and was familiar with the GIS world and data collection issues. His skill in leading the group to identify the issues and to solicit their solutions and acceptance of those issues was the catalyst for the success of the project. Any project attempting to develop a plan would be well advised to secure the services of such a facilitator.
2. The Director of the WV Office of GIS coordination also refrained from joining group discussions to keep his personal bias out of the process, to allow the stakeholders to discuss the issues from their own perspectives.
3. The format of the workshops was to include as much interaction as possible. Typically, concepts would be presented and then teams would generate ideas and report out. The results are posted on the web site. Flip chart team results and outcomes may be found at <https://sites.google.com/site/wvgisbusinessplan/results>
4. All ideas were welcome. Issues were discussed from a variety of perspectives. Participants were engaged and produced results. The participants took ownership of the results as well. When the initial draft was published and the document was sent out for review, several of the stakeholders who attended checked the attachment of workshop

attendees and sent an email indicating they had attended at least one session, yet their name was not included in Appendix A: Planning Workshop Participants.

5. The State Office of the GIS Coordinator provided lunch. That was an incentive to attend.

Practices that did not lead to success

1. Recruitment efforts did not attract planners or clerks. This may be due to restricted travel budgets. Workshop 4 was held in Shepherdstown, WV, a location that is remote, requiring intensive drive time for most participants.
2. There was a downward trend in participation. This could have been because of the summer vacation season, or people felt safe and/or supportive of what the group was accomplishing.
3. The Discussion site on the website was not utilized as hoped.
<https://sites.google.com/site/wvgisbusinessplan/discussion-group> Most follow up conversations and inputs were given at workshops.
4. There were some lessons learned in scheduling workshops to get the most participation. Two examples: 1. we thought trying to tie a workshop to an existing meeting would increase participation, but just the opposite was true. The day before was “golf day” and no one wanted to stay after the scheduled meeting. 2. Schedule workshops on a schedule to which the participants can become accustomed such as the third Thursday of the month. We also thought we should schedule the location around the state, but participants wanted to come to the same place for every meeting.

Explain how your project has advanced the NSDI.

The WV project had advanced the goals of the NSDI increasing the availability of data across government, private industry and academia; improving quality of data, and if the plan is fully implemented, it will result in reducing costs. The WV project supported the idea of open, shared data. While the stakeholders in the state are not ready to share data on a national level at this time, they “get” the idea and can see the value if such a system existed. The SLIS business plan provides the system to support open, shared data among the state entities. This was a mindset change brought about by the project. The quality of the data will be improved through training. The training, based on the work processes of the counties will disseminate best practices on how counties work. As tenured workers and new hires are trained and “on the same page”, quality will improve.

At a minimum, as a result of the project, West Virginia is one more state following NSDI standards.

Next Steps

The next steps are outside of the control of the Rahall Transportation Institute, but are dependent upon the actions of the WV Office of GIS Coordination. At the time of submission, these steps have been determined:

1. Build a demo of the Land Information System and present to the legislature.
2. Solicit direction from key government agencies as to funding possibilities.
3. Submit application for NSDI implementation funds.
4. Begin to write equipment and system specifications for vendors. The plan contains estimates, but this would be the next logical step.
5. Determine data conversion specifications and initiate discussion with WV purchasing procedures to answer questions such as:
 - a. What happens if different vendors have different prices for conversion projects?
 - b. Will funds be released to counties?
6. Request Bureau of Land Management for BLM data.
7. Activate the Policy Council to solicit funds from private industries.
8. Present plan to those in the oil and gas sector to demonstrate value in Marcellus Shale extraction.

How will this project continue into the future and remain viable?

The project will continue into the future by increasing the use and support of the system from shared funding of government agencies and private industry investment. Due to the Marcellus Shale extraction and processing opportunities, legislative focus is on serving the natural gas industry and the location of a Cracker facility in WV. The WV LIS would be a valuable resource for the oil and natural gas companies operating in WV. Fee for service would aid in the sustainability of the system.

Where do you need assistance? What type of assistance do you need?

WV submitted an application for an implementation grant. If funded we would like referrals to other states who have been successful implementing their plan in order for us to receive feedback of best practices

Feedback on Cooperative Agreements Program

What are the CAP Program strengths and weaknesses?

The strengths of the program are in the ease of the application and project reporting requirements.

RTI had a couple of bumps getting started. I feel it is important to include in the report, but by no means is the discussion meant as harsh criticism.

1. The need for "Pre Agreement Authorization" was not clear. We didn't think we needed it. Wrong. Thankfully the NSDI staff worked with us to resolve. The problem started when the start date was entered wrong during the electronic submission. Because I, as the PI, could not see what was actually submitted, it went unnoticed. We attended the meeting in Maryland as directed and proposed in our application and began work, only to find out the project could not be back dated. It was resolved. I would recommend that staff be alert to such quality control factors. If the project time line indicates activities before the start date, it should be investigated.
2. The requirements for attendance at NSGIC meetings were not clear. I budgeted for both meetings because I thought it was a requirement. When our person arrived in Idaho, he learned he was not supposed to give a presentation and attendance was not required. Funds used for travel could have been used elsewhere. I recommend this language be clarified.

3. Project time cycle. To require proposals to be submitted the first part of January and meeting attendance requirements if funded in March, does not allow enough time for agencies to set up agreements and allow for expenditures of funds.

Where does it make a difference?

The fact that you funded the planning phase separate from the implementation phase made a huge difference. The grant allowed time to be spent planning a project that allowed for input, created buy in and was structured to meet the needs of the stakeholders. So often, the planning phase is neglected, stakeholder influence is kept at a minimum and projects are implemented without thorough planning. When people jump the gun and begin implementation the results can be disastrous. Here are just a few examples:

1. A mismatch between products purchased and needs.
2. Budget overages caused by work orders not planned for
3. Unqualified vendors
4. Result that no one uses.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?

Above average, when compared to other projects!

What would you recommend that the FGDC do differently?

See above.

Are there factors that are missing or additional needs that should be considered? No

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed, such as the time frame?

See above.

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

The meeting schedule and location selection was discussed in a previous section. We discussed the “do over” perspective and we have a couple of items that may be considered lessons learned for future projects.

1. The word “work shop” was used because we wanted people to understand they were coming and working! However, we think some of the people did not attend future meetings because they thought it was a repeat of the workshop they had previously attended. We thought that giving them a letter of expectations may have helped.
2. Don't schedule workshops during busy times for Assessors, such as when tax tickets are due.