

These responses were developed by NRIS Advisory Committee Members to help MSL Geographic Information program understand what is required from each Member regarding:

1. Agency & MSL MOU
2. NRIS Annual Report

The following is the initial survey results and responses (compiled 11/19/12):

Agency & MSL MOU

DEQ

- DEQ requires this from our Office of Financial Services for any funds provided by DEQ
- A clearer contract of what DEQ funds are supporting and how they align with our communicated priorities and needs of MSL GI functions

DNRC

- Our agency would like to have detailed information on how our funding contribution is being spent. This is not a requirement, but there is some concern that the programs/functions being funded are not those that are most beneficial for our agency.

FWP

- FWP will continue to require the NRIS/FWP MOU for budgeting and clarity of how FWP funds are used.
- FWP is open to discussion about identifying more specific tasks/deliverables within the MOU that benefit FWP (e.g. 24k hydro).

MHS

- *No specific comment*

LEGIS

- *No specific comment*

NRIS Annual Report

DEQ

- DEQ agrees with exposing NRIS functions via MSL GI staff in a manner accessible by all MT GIS users as MSL GI work plans and the priorities of the Agencies included in the NRIS Advisory Committee affect and benefit all MT GIS users and efforts.
 - Separate from NRIS\Agency MOU; for the State, not just the Members
 - Accomplishments the previous FY and work plan for the next
 - Brief description of what, how to accomplish, and fund each item
 - Alignment with Member recommended priorities
 - High level report (ppt/outline format is sufficient)
 - posted to web site for all to see

DNRC

- I heard feedback from our agency that the ppt/outline format did not provide adequate detail. We are interested in more detailed reporting on how NRIS funding is being spent.
- This does not necessarily need to be in the format of a report to member agencies – as long as it was available in some format.
 - Accomplishments the previous FY and work plan for the next
 - Brief description of what, how to accomplish, and fund each item
 - Alignment with Member recommended priorities

FWP

- FWP feels that a separate member report is not necessary provided the annual report summarizes accomplishments related to agency's MOU specifics. Providing a less formal status update mid-year that outlines progress to date could be beneficial to member agencies and NRIS in measuring milestones relative to member agency priorities.

MHS

- For any type of funding support an annual report of activities is vital. The MOU and the annual report should be kept separate, but still have both available on the web site for members and anyone else to view. The current format, via the ppt, is a nice tidy way to keep it concise, but informative. However, adding a work plan for the next year is a great idea.

LEGIS

- I'm not sure the annual report needs to be at the level detail or effort that it is now. As was said in the meetings, the MOUs do outline what is happening pretty well. But for those who may not be agency users, a more general, narrative report may be useful.