Executive Summary

Members or Designees
Robin Trenbeath – Department of Administration; Mike Bousliman – Department of Transportation; Connie Eissinger - McCone County Commissioner; William Groupos - Bureau of Land Management; Annette Cabrera – Yellowstone County; Lance Clampitt – US Department of the Interior; Art Pembroke – Lewis and Clark County; Alex Philp – GCS Research LLC; Erin Geraghty – Base Map Service Center; Lorin Peterson – Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes IT Manager; Jon Sesso – House District 76; Darlene Staffeldt & Jennie Stapp – Montana State Library; Kris Larson – CDM; Ted Chase – Department of Revenue; Dan Chelini – Department of Environmental Quality; and Catherine Maynard – US Department of Agriculture

Guests
Joshua Dorris, Keith Blount & Stu Kirkpatrick – DOA/ITSD/BMCS; Evan Hammer – MSL/NRIS; Clayton Vine – Roosevelt County GIS; Mike Sweet – University of Montana; Jackie Riley – Gallatin National Forest; James Arnold & Rudy Persaud – US Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration; Trudy Skari – Department of Commerce; Linda Vance – Montana Natural Heritage Program; Timothy Klein – US Department of Transportation/RITA PNT and RJ Zimmer – DJ&A, Inc.

January Executive Summary - ***APPROVED***

Tribal Nations Grant Workshop – Robin Trenbeath/Lorin Peterson
A 3-day Tribal MSDI Grant Workshop was held in January. There were representatives from most of the tribes and it was, overall, a very successful workshop. As a result, three tribes applied for MSDI grants. We recommend that we continue the grant workshop/outreach program with the tribes and the two-way communications.

Observations of a Newcomer – Connie Eissinger
As a result of my membership on the council, I have tried to talk to my peers about GIS and observed that for some, their eyes glaze over as soon as they hear the term GIS. As someone who does not use GIS everyday, you talk a different language and I often have no idea what you're talking about. The point is that if you want to be successful with decision/policy makers, you must learn to use a vocabulary appropriate to the audience's understanding of the subject.

After the meeting, Connie provided the Chair with a copy of a letter to the Governor resigning from the Council. Although reluctant to leave the Council, Connie had to make the difficult choice due to her duties as a McCone County Commissioner, 2nd Vice President of MACo, and other state and local obligations.

Grants Subcommittee
2008/2009/2010 Grant Status – Stu Kirkpatrick
All 2008 grants have been closed, except the Salish Kootenai wetlands grant and there is only $4000 left in that contract. All grants are proceeding normally, except for one which may not be approved for an extension (as far as we know, no activity has occurred to date). 2010 – There have been good reports, with many of the grants coming in under budget.

FY2011 Grant Applications – Annette Cabrera/Stu Kirkpatrick
See Annette Cabrera's handout, dated April 19th. There were 17 grants submitted. The MLIA Council Grants Subcommittee is recommending ten (10) for funding, four (4) that may be at least partially funded depending on clarification/negotiations with the applicants to ensure they are coordinating with Framework Stewards, delivering products beneficial to the GIS community, etc., and three (3) "Do Not Fund" proposals. Comments from Council members on the grants and the subcommittee's recommendations must be made to Robin Trenbeath by Monday, May 3, 2010. All grants applications are available online.

Annette reported that before the subcommittee started on the grant review process, they had a lengthy discussion on process and criteria; similar to the ones entertained by previous subcommittees. The group decided to do something about the issues and invited former members of Grant Subcommittees to meet with them in one month to discuss a number of issues/concerns, including:

- Grant Extensions
- Authoritative Person Signing Off on Grant Applications
- BMSC/MSDI Layers – Should we be handling these separately?

Recommendations will be made to the Council.

Council Policy Review of Steward's Report – Connie Eissinger.
See handout: "Policy Review of MSDI framework themes".
The Stewardship Review Subcommittee was Jon Sesso, Allen Peura, and Connie Eissinger (Chair). The primary things that the group looked at:

1. Funding
2. Marketing
3. Training
4. Integration & Standarization

This will be discussed at next MLIAC meeting. Jennie Stapp asked if there could be action items before next meeting, and Robin answered in the **affirmative**.

GIS Funding Subcommittee Report
Updated MSDI Funding Proposal – Robin Trenbeath ***Action Item***
Jennie made some relatively minor report changes that were approved by the subcommittee.

Art Pembroke moved approval of the Report. Dan Chelini seconded.

Discussion:

Lance Clampitt stated that framework data is not really MSDI; the Montana Spatial Data Infrastructure is much larger. Robin Trenbeath reminded the Council that "MSDI" isn't the best way to communicate with a decision-maker. We could clean up the language to more effectively communicate with the public. **Connie will review the document to make sure it is more understandable by decision-makers.**

Catherine Maynard noted that page 4 refers to Appendix XX and asked if this still belongs? Robin noted that this is a holdover from previous iterations and should be **deleted.**

Mike Bousliman asked if the $600,000 on page 8 was just staff time. Robin answered yes, but clarified by stating that it is not just for BMSC, an estimate from all the framework stewards of staff time and some small operational costs (e.g., supplies). Stu noted that it does not include hardware, software, storage, hosting, etc.; it's primarily staff time. Robin further noted that in a true long-term funding model, we need to look at all of the costs, not just staff time.

Catherine Maynard pointed out that in the last paragraph on page 8 the document states "GIO, with the assistance of the council, shall develop rules for the distribution of these funds." She suggested that the correct word is probably should not "rule". Robin indicated he would fix the sentence by inserting "**guidelines.**"

Dan Chelini noted that we already seeing Cadastral, Imagery, and Transportation service charges and asked if they are they funding some of this staff time and/or part of the State's ESRI ELA. Robin responded by stating that no; this $600,000 is staff time; the ELA and support for the State's Enterprise GIS Architecture NOT part of this.

Jon Sesso acknowledged that he approves of the way we are proceeding to shift the burden to a more general fund concept and that we should continue to strive for this, but is unsure of what happens next. Do you go to Director Kelly and ask to put this in the DOA budget? Whatever you do, in today's financial climate, it is not going very far. He doesn't want anyone having the false expectation that he can champion getting this money; there's a long line of people

expecting me to champion their causes. He further stated that he is in favor of the concept, but given the financial environment of the State, is not capable of pulling a rabbit out of the hat. Nothing is going to happen now, but it's good to get in line and lay out a long-term strategy.

Robin agreed and stated that he understands that clearly. This is not an EPP item. As proposed at the last meeting, he will take the approved report to Dick and Janet as a demonstration of the Council's long-term strategic direction. The message is although we are clear that nothing is going to happen this biennium, if something comes up…decision-makers understand where we are going.

Catherine Maynard noted that we all should be clear that this was the discussion and motion by Darlene at the last MLIAC meeting.

The report with the minor changes noted above was unanimously approved.

MSDI/BMSC Funding – Robin Trenbeath

ITSD must recover all of its dollars through rates. In order to provide more transparency in those costs, ITSD has moved to a FMM (Full Cost Maturity Model) methodology for setting rates. The change is intended to break out costs and provide more detail. As part of that effort, some of the costs that go into supporting GIS hardware, software, etc. (e.g., Cadastral database hosting) is being proposed to be recovered by rates. The services are used by State agencies, the Private sector, the General Public, and the Feds. Currently, there is no way to recover these costs except from State agencies. My philosophy was to break the costs out into two parts; the Enterprise and specific agency usage. The largest portion comprises about 67% to 75% of the charges and is included within the Enterprise Rate; that "overhead" charge (e.g., GIO salary) spread across all agencies based on their size.

The other portion (approximately 25% to 33%) that can be attributed to agencies is contained in specific service charges (e.g., image web services). The theory is that if an agency is using imagery, they don't have to download the 4Tb+ of data and store it locally (probably more than one time), there is no need for ESRI Image Server software, they do not need to use server cycles hosting the data, the agency does not have to hire the technical expertise to operate the software, etc.; they simply imbed a service in the application. The rate is ~$1,200 per year per service. Because this is a new program and we don't know how many services each agency is/might use during next biennium, and because this is a budgeting exercise, I assigned one to three services to those agencies I thought might use the service. However, as part of the budget cycle, each agency gets to refine those numbers and include their won estimation of the cost into their next biennium budget.

During the last biennium budget process these costs were included within the mid-tier or desk top rates; effectively hiding the true costs from agencies. What I tried to do was to fairly distribute these costs across the appropriate State agencies. Should we continue to explore other mechanisms (e.g., convenience or value-added fees) to recover costs; most certainly, but until we find a more appropriate instrument, this is the process we must use.

Catherine Maynard stated that she was still unclear. For example, the web service that BMSC now uses to serve NAIP imagery --- you want consumers to pay for that? We've already paid for that data. Robin agreed, the data has been paid for, but the charges are for the real costs associated with hosting and delivering that information. Catherine reiterated that taxpayers (Feds) have already paid for this and the concept seems to work against the Federated Model. She does not feel the State should charge.

Art Pembroke noted that we all can agree, data collection is something that is generally funded for the public good. However, providing the hosting and delivery services to users isn't free; infrastructure costs money. It's not charging or making a profit, it's just serving the data up for consumption, and someone has to pay.

Jennie Stapp explained that libraries struggle with this all the time; conceptually, charging users for service is against their basic principles. She agreed with Catherine and noted that it is a philosophical discussion. There are other agencies providing web services, and they do not

charge for services.

Mike Bousliman noted that philosophically, we're not doing anything different than we've always done. I do not understand Catherine's point. MDT is not complaining, but they're not a big user of web services, and help pay for MSDI as part of the Enterprise rate. He suggested that maybe we need 45 minutes to try to explain to the Council where all this money is coming from/going to?

Catherine explained that nationwide, there is a huge investment in these datasets and that the USGS has a sophisticated delivery mechanism. NRCS also delivers data to the public at large. They are funded by Congress to not just collect the data, but also to distribute it to the public/taxpayers. The Feds pay the bulk of the money and do the bulk of the work collecting imagery data. The State of Montana makes a small contribution. Why does the State have customized delivery options that are specific to their needs and why should we fund this? The Federal partners are already serving the data, so maybe the money that the Feds give to the State should diminish over time.

Dan stated that in his opinion, the plan is not perfect, but now we can look at what our real costs are for hosting, serving, ports, etc. It's what we're stuck with for now. He does not see an opportunity for us to just go get GIS funding from General Funds. There is really nothing that's changed. We still pay what we've always paid, but now it is itemized and we can see it.

Catherine stated that imagery could be provided to MSL and MSL would serve it up free, which is more in line with the Federal Partnership.

Robin noted that even at MSL they need servers, storage, software, technical expertise, etc. and all that costs money. Where does it come from? We have to pay for the infrastructure somehow.

Catherine clarified by stating that the feds can use the USGS and NRCS existing federal websites already; so I'm just asking you to consider what this means in terms of Federal Partnerships.

Alex Philp asked if this is just a repackaging of an existing charge. Dan answered in the affirmative. Alex went on to state that the National Map was created by USGS a few years ago when we had 5 different versions of the same thing. We got into discussions of "Who has the best layer?" There were a couple different DRG layers, a few different image layers, a couple of this, a few of that. We've been working to build a federation for 5-6 years and are we tearing this all apart just over semantics? We don't need to go backwards just to save a buck.

Jennie Stapp stated that we don't have an additional $12,000 to fund this. But we do have the software, technology, expertise to serve the data ourselves. This is not what is at the heart of the federation concept.

Robin Trenbeath: This conversation will continue…

Adding/Removing MSDI Framework Themes – Lance Clampitt ***Action Item***
Catherine Maynard, Erin Geraghty, Kris Larson and Robin Trenbeath were on the sub-committee to look at MSDI framework layers and how new layers might be approved and/or how existing layers might be reviewed. Lance quickly reviewed the proposed process.

RJ Zimmer asked for clarification on what does it mean to be a MSDI theme. Early on, there were the I-Teams, etc. and we've evolved to the point of having the Council and the GIO approve layers. He's unsure of what, exactly this means to a steward. Lance responded that any layer that makes it through the process has to have someone that cares about it, and that he believes that no layer would come to the Council with zero funding.

RJ's next question was what the Council provides to MSDI layer stewards. Robin responded that with approval, the layer is identified as a "definitive" source (see discussion below). RJ asked for that to be articulated, and asked what the Council's role is with respect to funding framework layers. Catherine explained that we intentionally kept funding out of the discussion to avoid muddying the waters.

Erin Geraghty asked how a non-existent layer could be imbedded into core state processes. Robin asked the Council to look at GNIS example, and Lance followed up by noting that if you are going to request data be made a MSDI layer, you have to do some groundwork. People that are interested in developing a layer have already identified some possible stewards, some funding sources, how the data is used/could be used, etc.

Annette Cabrera asked what we do if a proposed layer more appropriately falls under an existing approved layer. Robin noted that perhaps the draft decision tree was not clear on that point; any 'new' layer applying for approval would necessarily be reviewed in terms of other approved MSDI framework layers. Part of that review would be asking the question of whether the new layer should stand alone or be included as part of another MSDI layer.

Alex asked if we could add the word "authoritative." Art noted that we cannot use 'authoritative' in the sense being suggested; the word is a surveyors' term of art and only confuses our discussions. Robin agreed with Erin's suggestion; the word we should use is "Definitive" source.

Alex Philp moved and Art Pembroke seconded a motion to approve the proposed process. The Council approved the motion.

Erin asked if people will be required to use these definitive sources. Robin responded by stating that as recommended by the MSDI stewards, he is looking into adopting a State Standard that essentially will affirm that, "If you are going to use MSDI-type data, you must use the definitive MSDI source." He talked to the DOA lawyers and it looks like this can be done under the CIO's policy/standard setting authority. However, it is important that we allow for exceptions in the process. Getting this standard will be a long, slow process, one that will first have to be widely vetted with the entire State GIS/IT community.

MAGIP Report - Erin Geraghty
The Conference was the highlight of the report. Allen Armstrong worked very hard to put on a really great conference. There was more tribal interaction than ever before and more topics than ever before, for example, a whole track on avalanches. The summit was on Tuesday and the members suggestions for improvements/future directions will be used to create our 2010/2011work plan.

Updates and New Business
$240K Budget & Coordination Activities – Robin Trenbeath
Starting late last year we were able to finally break this out of the State accounting system (see spreadsheet). Robin is tracking how much has been spent and anticipated spending. Council members should pay particular note to the 'comments' field in some of the cells because they contain information about how the projections are calculated. Jon suggested that we not call the financial report an "Administrative Fee Budget," but a "Coordination Budget." (**Done**) Catherine recommended showing the FTE count. (**Done**)

BMSC Outreach – Stu Kirkpatrick
BMSC worked with Missoula County to convert their Cadastral to a GCDB base. Staff have been going over to Missoula every three weeks and we expect to complete the project this summer. Erin visited Richland and other counties to talk about their municipal boundary and other boundaries, and staff has worked closely with the State Historic Preservation Office to complete some database updates.

Broadband Mapping – Stu Kirkpatrick
The BMSC is working with DOC on broadband mapping. The first deliverables were due April 15, and everyone is pleased with the progress so far. There is a signed MOU with DOC, and under the document the BMSC will probably be hiring 1 to 1.5 FTE to assist in the program.

Alex Philp asked if the layer will be available for consumption. Stu answered yes, noting that this may spur private broadband vendors to provide more accurate data. Cell towers data is already available from the FDC, but broadband availability is based on Census Block. TetraTech is using MSDI framework data as a major contributor to their dataset.

GNIS as MSDI Layer – Lance Clampitt/Robin Trenbeath

The Names Layer was run through the new DRAFT (approved earlier in the meeting) policy and it passed the mandatory requirements, and scored 35 points out of 45 points possible. **The Names subcommittee will submit this to Robin Trenbeath and it will be an action item at our next meeting**.

The Names Subcommittee will work to ensure that we coordinate with Structures, Addresses, and other Framework Data layers as necessary.

NAIP Status – Robin Trenbeath

NAIP was delivered 1½ months ago and is available for use on the image server. The 2005 NAIP has been transferred to MSL for archiving. The 2009 county mosaics are also available at MSL. If there are any technical questions, contact Michael Fashoway.

Lance noted that the Fed government is trying to move the imagery acquisition time from 3 years to every 2 years. Although this sounds positive because the State may not have to find matching funds for this acquisition schedule, the current plan is to only include Ag lands, thereby leaving the state in the same situation, to get meaningful data we will be required to raise our cost-share, but on a 2-year cycle.

MLIA Coordination Activities – Robin Trenbeath

See handout "GIO/BMSC Activity Hours." The data includes time records for all seven BMSC employees + the GIO during the period January 2 – April 9, 2010. The chart demonstrates that many more hours of coordination time are being spent than are funded under the 2 FTE MLIA Coordination Budget (see above). Annette stated that she doesn't think this information is really necessary, and the Council agreed. Robin responded that he would continue to track time for internal management purposes, but will not produce the Council reports.

MSDI and Lincoln County EPA Clean-up– Ed Madej

Ed Madej was not in attendance. **His report will be moved to the September agenda**.

Control Point Database Demo –R. J. Zimmer

See PowerPoint presentation.

Open Forum and Public Comment

None.

Next Meeting Date, Location and Agenda Items – Robin Trenbeath

Our normally scheduled meeting is less than a month away. We can vote electronically on GNIS if that were important to Lance. The Land Plan Committee needs to be appointed by July 1st, but we can do that electronically. Everyone voted for having the next meeting on September 2, 2010 and to put the GNIS Council action vote off until that time.

Next Meeting – September 2, 2010

Topics for Next Meeting

- GNIS as an MSDI layer
- Land Plan Committee
- Grant Review Process – Grants Subcommittee
- Funding
  - o Meeting with Director/State budget process
  - o Standard MLIA Coordination Funding Report
- Stewardship Review Process – Current MSDI layers
- MSDI and Lincoln County EPA Clean-up
- Policy Review Report – Action Items