

# FGDC Fifty States Initiative 2011 Workshop Report



March 31, 2011

Contract Number: 08HQC�0024/0002

Task 0002AC

## Table of Contents

1	Quick Overview .....	1
2	Agenda.....	2
3	Attendees .....	4
4	Feedback .....	5
4.1	Top Ten Takeaways & Observations 2011 .....	5
4.2	Evaluation Results .....	6
5	Lessons Learned from State Case Studies.....	9
5.1	Arizona.....	9
5.2	Idaho.....	10
5.3	Oregon.....	10
5.4	US Virgin Islands.....	11
6	Draft Agenda for 2012.....	12
7	Fifty States Project Team .....	13

## 1 Quick Overview

The 2011 Workshop for the Fifty States Program CAP Grant recipients (Categories 3 & 4) was held at the NSGIC Mid-Year Meeting in Annapolis, Maryland, on Sunday February 27, 2011. There were 28 individuals who came to participate in the workshop and learn about the GIS Strategic and Business Planning Process in support of the Fifty States Initiative. This was the sixth consecutive year that the workshop has been conducted. Attendees included a variety of interested NSGIC members, contractors, and federal agency staff, as well as 2011 recipients of Fifty States CAP Grants, including representatives from eight (8) of the following eleven (11) states comprising the “Class of 2011”:

### Category 3:

1. Tennessee
2. New Jersey

### Category 4:

1. California
2. Florida
3. Idaho & Montana
4. Louisiana
5. Minnesota
6. Utah
7. West Virginia
8. Wisconsin

Red text indicates state did not attend workshop.

## 2 Agenda

### FGDC Fifty States Program Strategic & Business Planning Workshop

#### AGENDA

February 27, 2011 (Sunday)

Loews Annapolis Hotel

Room: Regatta A

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>8:00 AM</b>        | <b><i>Gathering, coffee and social networking</i></b>  |
| <b><u>PLENARY</u></b> | <b><u>Introduction</u></b>   |
| <b>8:30</b>           | NSGIC Welcome and Agenda Review<br><i>Bill Burgess, Washington Liaison for NSGIC</i>   |
| <b>8:40</b>           | Opening Remarks on 50 States Initiative by FGDC<br><i>Ken Shaffer, Deputy Executive Director FGDC</i>  |
| <b>8:45</b>           | The "Class of 2011" New CAP Fifty States Grant Recipients<br><i>Scott Van Hoff, Fifty States Program Manager</i>   |
| <b>9:15</b>           | Case Studies of Past Recipients of CAP Fifty States Grants<br><i>Gene Trobia (Arizona), Keith Weber (Idaho), Cy Smith (Oregon),<br/>Stevie Henry (US Virgin Islands)</i> |
| <b>10:00</b>          | Measuring Progress: Presentation/Facilitated Discussion<br><i>Rich Grady AppGeo</i>  |
| <b>10:35</b>          | <b>*** 15 Minute B R E A K ***</b>   |



**ROOM A**

**Category 4 (Business Plan) CAP Grant Recipients and Others**

**10:50**  
*Regatta A*

Business Planning Process & Guidelines  
*Rich Grady, AppGeo*

**11:20**

Business Plan Questions/Answers

**11:50**

Reconvene Plenary Session

**ROOM B**

**Category 3 (Strategic Plan) CAP Grant Recipients and Others**

**10:50**  
*Regatta B*

Strategic Planning Process & Guidelines  
*Michael Turner, AppGeo*

**11:20**

Strategic Plan Questions/Answers

**11:50**

Reconvene Plenary Session

**PLENARY**

**"NEXT STEPS" & WRAP-UP**

**11:55**

Fifty States "Next Steps"  
*Rich Grady, AppGeo*

**12:20 PM**

Questions/Answers & Wrap-up

**12:30**

**\*\*\*ADJOURN\*\*\***

### 3 Attendees

Name	Organization	Class of 2011 Grant Recipient
Malcolm Adkins	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.	
David Arbeit	MN - MGIO	Yes
William Burgess	NSGIC	
Kim Cloud	DE - Dept. of Technology & Info (DTI)	
Gail Ewart	IGO/Idaho	Yes
Robert Godbey	WV/Rahall Transportation Institute (RTI)	
Rich Grady	AppGeo	
Bert Granberg	Utah AGRC	Yes
Phillip Henderson	AL/Alabama Department of Economic & Community Affairs (ADECA)	
Kate Lommen Hickey	AppGeo	
Charley Hickman	USGS Ohio	
Spencer Jenkins	Utah AGRC	Yes
Craig Johnson	Lousiana Geographic Information Center (LAGIC)	Yes
Jim Lacy	University of Wisconsin - Madison	Yes
Francis Oswald	Oswald Assocs.	
Dennis Pedersen	TN - Dept. of F & A GIS Coordinator	Yes
Leland Pierce	NM Geospatial Advisory Committee	
Curtis Pulford	WI/Geographic Information Office	Yes
Thomas Rossman	Kentucky Division of Geographic Information	
Andy Rowan	NJ Office of GIS	Yes
Joe Sewash	NC Center for Geographic Information & Analysis	
Tony Simental	WV/Office of GIS Coordination	Yes
Michael Turner	AppGeo	
Gene Trobia	Arizona - State Cartographer's Office	
Scott VanHoff	USGS	
Keith Weber	GIS Director, Idaho State University	Yes
Shane White	RI Statewide Planning Program	

## 4 Feedback

### 4.1 Top Takeaways & Observations 2011

#### 4.1.1 *Takeaways*

- Allow more time for **sharing of information between states, discussion and networking**, expanding on the short presentations/lightning talks.
- **Focus on material directly relevant to grant** not on measuring NSDI progress and high level nationwide view
- Consider shift toward **digital workshop** with use of **web presentation** and distribution of materials via thumb drive or FTP download
- **Elaborate on distinction** between strategic and business planning with everyone in plenary
- **Provide guidance** on how to balance centralized vs. distributed activities
- **Present examples of how to “Craft a Good Story”** allowing decision makers to understand how strategic and business plans tie into broader goals
- **Provide more guidance on quantifying the benefits** – this remains a big challenge but is essential for buy-in.
- **Facilitate discussion** about how to be nimble and flexible while staying focused on goals.
- **Continue the breakout sessions** for Strategic Planning and for Business Planning in parallel
- **Provide more info from FGDC** on expectations and timelines for grant recipients

#### 4.1.2 *Observations*

- **Status of Fifty States Program** and associated CAP grant assistance is uncertain for next year
- **A distinct shift from Strategic to Business planning** has occurred, including a focus on statewide framework layers and themes
- **Buy-ups and cost sharing** are increasingly popular
- States that have completed plans are implementing them and experiencing some successes, particularly in terms of effective stakeholder involvement and executive awareness and support

## 4.2 Evaluation Results

**Date and Location:** February 27, 2011 - NSGIC Mid-Year Conference  
**Instructor(s):** Fifty States Project Team and State Collaborators  
**Title of Workshop:** Fifty States Initiative CAP Grant Recipient Workshop

**NOTE:** We received 14 completed evaluations. The table below shows the number of occurrences for each score, and the average score for each evaluated item. The overall average score across all evaluations for all evaluated items was 4.18 out of 5.0 (1 “1”, 6 “2s”, 21 “3s”, 57 “4s”, & 55 “5s”).

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>		<i>Strongly Agree</i>			<b>Average Score</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
1. The overall experience of the workshop was positive.		1		9	4	<b>4.14</b>
2. The amount of information was appropriate for the time allowed.			3	6	5	<b>4.14</b>
3. The presentations provided me useful information.		1	2	6	5	<b>4.07</b>
4. The pace, style, and use of presentation media was effective.	1		4	7	2	<b>3.64</b>
5. The workshop content was meaningful.		1	2	8	3	<b>3.93</b>
6. Questions were encouraged.			2	4	8	<b>4.43</b>
7. The instructors responded to questions effectively.			2	4	8	<b>4.43</b>
8. The presenters were knowledgeable about the subject.			1	5	8	<b>4.50</b>
9. The discussion was constructive.		1	1	6	6	<b>4.21</b>



	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5	
10. The workshop format was useful and effective.		2	4	2	6	3.86

**4.2.1 What were the major strengths of the workshop?(Actual Survey Comments)**

- Other states sharing their experiences; open discussion on issues
- Pushing discussion/previous & current CAP grant folks
- Learning more detail about other grants; handouts
- Detailed breakout sessions
- Case studies; Q & A
- Networking is always the major strength – should plan for more
- Details of expectations
- Comments from those who had completed business plans
- The breakout session describing the plan elements/guidelines was very helpful and informative; experiences of past recipients was good – interesting to see how much we all differ
- Brings folks together; discussion
- Knowledge of the presenters was great. It was also good to hear what is going on in other states
- Information shared by other states regarding lessons learned & what they did

**4.2.2 What aspects of the workshop could be improved and how?(Actual Survey Comments)**

- Spend some time on the checklists for keeping yourself on track, just to keep folks aware
- “Measuring Progress” was marginally interesting, and not directly relevant. Would rather focus on information and particulars more specific to the grants. Discussions wandered off topic beyond the purpose of the

workshop. Minimal FGDC involvement in the workshop? Would be nice to hear more specifics about their expectations, timelines, and so forth.

- Time shortened
- Most adults cannot take much more than 15 minutes of “talking heads” without losing attention. Need to have audience do things, e.g. Tools=Stakeholder matrix
- Could this be done using GoToMeeting or something similar?
- Could be done in less time (3 hours)
- The “Measuring Progress” discussion dragged, didn’t break enough new ground or move fast enough! Pace vs. content – too much time for the amount of ground covered. Too much time on overview and summary, not enough on the meat.
- Didn’t feel that there is real guidance about Business Plan
- More time for questions. And remember DE.

### **4.2.3 *What would be “one more thing” that might help advance your planning initiative in support of NSDI?(Actual Survey Comments)***

- Webinar on sales pitch for these plans
- Much of the workshop could be accomplished in two 2-hour Web Ex sessions. May need to consider this for the future.
- More funding
- Electronic version of handouts
- More money! Workshops on Facilitation, Project Management, Marketing (for cheap)
- Improving Ramona will help us post the data as it comes in
- I would like to hear FGDC articulate more clearly what they plan to do to move NSDI ahead while still facilitating states to meet their unique needs.
- IT architecture & support for data layers

## 5 Lessons Learned from State Case Studies

The Workshop included 4 presentations from prior CAP grant recipients. These case studies were presented as “Lightning Talks” where each speaker was given 7 minutes to share the highlights and “lessons learned” from their particular project.

### 5.1 Arizona

- **What We Did Right**
  - We got the entire Arizona Geographic Information Council involved in supporting our grant request and in creating a review committee to become involved in the project.
  - We promoted SB1318 which facilitated data sharing in Arizona and established AGIC in legislation. As the SB1318 proceeded through the legislative process, we made changes to it based on findings from our Strategic Plan. SB1318 became law Sep. 2010 (ARS 37-178).
  - We knew that we did not have the resources and expertise to conduct a strategic and business plan project on our own, so we obtained the services of highly knowledgeable and experienced consultants to provide guidance and expertise. We believe it strengthened our proposal and certainly paid off in results.
- **Problems We Had**
  - Hard to hold enough workshops throughout the state to obtain input from all GIS stakeholders in Arizona (a lot of empty space between most cities and towns) and our outreach efforts did not draw a crowd proportionate to the GIS activities in the Phoenix area.
  - The burst of the housing bubble and large State budget deficits.
  - Unexpected transition of Governor and replacement of most senior State executives.
- **What I Wish We Had Done**
  - I wish we had the time and resources to conduct more workshops.
  - I would like to have had more support from the Governor’s Office, but with a new administration and huge looming budget deficit, it was hard to get their attention.
  - I would have liked to figure out ways to have more input from outside the GIS community. Then we would have heard from non-GIS types and possible future users.

## 5.2 Idaho

- **What We Did Right**
  - Communication was key. We sought and received tremendous stakeholder participation
  - We kept the momentum going.
  - We kept an eye on our timeline and sought to achieve more than the minimum.
- **Problems We Had**
  - Originally two RRC's were involved (east Idaho and southeast Idaho), these merged nearly half-way through the program, requiring a bit of retro-fitting. No serious setback actually occurred however.
  - In Idaho there are always barriers due to geography. The best way around this was to leverage telecommunications and the Internet
  - While seeking a consultant to take on the project with us, we sent out many, many requests but only two respondents. Luckily, both were strong and a good selection was made
- **What I Wish We Had Done**
  - While we sought legislative/decision maker input, there seemed to be little interest. I wish we had been more successful in these efforts.
  - I wish we had been able to write a business plan that was not considered a daunting document (43 pages). We are currently developing an executive summary to help facilitate a good understanding of the BP without all its "daunting-ness".
  - I wish I could have thought of a third... but that's a good problem to have!

## 5.3 Oregon

- **What We Did Right**
  - We had really good stakeholder participation through outreach sessions and Steering Committee involvement
  - We aligned our planning initiative and goals with the Metro regional government
  - We initiated an ROI study that will ultimately inform our goal to modify our funding model
- **Problems We Had**
  - It was tough to stay focused on the strategic planning initiative

- We weren't able to complete the ROI study during the planning period
- Hard to get local governments to take ownership
- **What I Wish We Had Done**
  - It would have been good to have better alignment with the new Governor and Legislature
  - We should have completed the Strategic Planning process more quickly
  - We should have communicated the planning results more broadly

## **5.4 US Virgin Islands**

- **What We Did Right**
  - Integrating the workshops with the Territorial GIS conference contributed to substantive stakeholder participation
  - One and one interviews of present and past leadership contributed significantly to the output
  - We had a good working meeting with Governor's cabinet
  - We were able to get legislative support and initial funding the street addressing project
- **Problems We Had**
  - Procurement process was painstakingly slow;
  - Individuals more interested in their political agendas than actually contributing to the plan;
  - It was difficult to obtain comments and feedback on-line early in the process;
- **What I Wish We Had Done**
  - We (VI GIS Council) wish had more budgetary detail prepared for inclusion in the FY 2011 project.

## 6 Draft Agenda for 2012

### Draft “Straw Man” Agenda for 2012

(Factoring in Feedback from 2011)

<b>8:00 AM</b>	<b><i>Gathering, coffee and social networking</i></b>
<b><u>PLENARY</u></b>	<b><u>Introduction</u></b>
<b>8:30</b>	NSGIC Welcome and Agenda Review
<b>8:40</b>	FGDC on Fifty States Initiative <i>[Added time for FGDC to present on Expectations for Reporting and Timetable]</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Opening Remarks</li> <li>○ Expectations and Report Requirements</li> </ul>
<b>8:55</b>	The “Class of 2012” New CAP Fifty States Grant Recipients
<b>9:25</b>	Case Studies & Discussion of Past Recipients of CAP Grants <i>[Extended time to allow more time for questions and discussion]</i>
<b>10:35</b>	<b>*** 15 Minute B R E A K ***</b>
<b><u>ROOM A</u></b>	<b><u>Category 4 (Business Plan) CAP Grant Recipients and Others</u></b>
<b>10:50</b>	Business Planning Process & Guidelines
<b>11:20</b>	Business Plan Questions/Answers
<b>11:50</b>	Reconvene Plenary Session
<b><u>ROOM B</u></b>	<b><u>Category 3 (Strategic Plan) CAP Grant Recipients and Others</u></b>
<b>10:50</b>	Strategic Planning Process & Guidelines
<b>11:20</b>	Strategic Plan Questions/Answers
<b>11:50</b>	Reconvene Plenary Session
<b><u>PLENARY</u></b>	<b><u>“NEXT STEPS” &amp; WRAP-UP</u></b>
<b>11:55</b>	Fifty States “Next Steps”
<b>12:20 PM</b>	Questions/Answers & Wrap-up
<b>12:30</b>	<b>***A D J O U R N***</b>

## 7 Fifty States Project Team

Project Sponsors:



Prime Contractor:



Subcontractors:

