

**OGICM
Executive Office Building
155 Cottage Street NE
Conference Room A
December 20, 2006**

Special Recognition – Presented by Cy Smith

- Brett Juul and Craig Greenleaf

Data Sharing Partnership – Cy Smith

Agreed Upon Action Plan & Request for Legislative Work Group

The following presentation was made:

<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/datasharing/Round1SummaryActionPlan.ppt>

The Data Sharing Partnership has been worked on for the past 8 months. The presentation represents the consensus with local and state government on sharing data between local and state government agencies. An action plan has been revised based on input from different agencies and local governments for moving the partnership forward which will yield statewide benefits.

The Development Approach – The state is committed to working with the local government and key stake holders in developing partnerships. Local governments are committed to participating in discussions and actions leading to development of partnership. What data do we have and what technology is out there to share – what data is needed to be shared? This information will guide the definitions of roles and responsibilities.

Potential State Government Contributions - Funds provided to local governments for data development to compensate for potential lost revenues. Administrative mechanisms created to enable collection and redistribution of local funds for specific purposes.

Question - What's the scale of funding? Answer - Cy – probably in the tens of thousands. This will be less for some counties. Potential state government contributions may also include statewide data, data standards, and federal coordination.

GIS Files – Data from local governments may also include owners' names at some point, but not on the list now due to privacy issues that have yet to be resolved. This will be put on the back burner for now. State agencies would like to have this information. Business license data have similar proprietary dimensions.

State Data Stewardship – Not adding work. Partnership will include phased development in 3 phases:

- Phase I – Reapplying concepts - administrative mechanisms
- Phase II – Initial commitment and delivery of high priority products and services

- Phase III –Continued Efforts to Add Jurisdictions to the Partnership and to Evolve Products and Services.

Communication is a very high priority for everybody. We need to communicate more effectively, beyond OGIC.

Proposed Implementation – We are working on a document of intent of local government and the state to work together on a partnership. There are 3 pieces to get help from legislature:

- Liability and risk
- Privacy and confidentiality
- Sustainable funding

It has been discussed to put together a legislative work group, before mid January, to work on these 3 pieces. There would be one work group. The state commitment is to make efforts to prevent data from being misused. This is very difficult to do and this is a concern. It is anticipated that there will be approximately 15 voting people in this work group.

GIS Software Standard

DAS is moving forward with creating ESRI as the GIS software standard. To do that, DAS will establish an administrative rule. You can have various versions of ESRI, not everybody has to be in tandem for the standard to be initiated. Other mapping software will still be able to be used. We are not trying to prohibit the use of other products, there will be an exception/exemption process. In some cases, we have delegated authority, under the existing policy, to other agencies to manage non-ESRI products within their agency, following certain guidelines and rules and reporting back on what they are doing periodically. There are those 2 ways of dealing with other software products. There are other business reasons to use other products that are already in place, we are trying to keep that from expanding, unless there's a really valid reason for it, in order to make the enterprise use of GIS software more efficient and cost effective. If there's a good business case for using non-ESRI software, that could still happen.

OGIC will have input in developing rules and the whole process. In the obligations of rule making, it might be a good idea and it does make sense to name OGIC as the advisory committee in the rule making effort. It would make sense rather than creating another independent effort aimed at this to try and use structure that we already have in place. We have Mark Williams with DOJ to advise us on this. Dugan and Cy met with him once to begin the discussion where he told us this is how you are going to have to do it. We sent him away with questions for him to find answers to but he didn't specifically talk about that, so we haven't gotten into the details yet. I'm not sure that OGIC would be the best advisory group, should it be OGIC or policy advisory sub committee of OGIC as advisory group?

Jim – OUS – I have a concern in limiting researchers and there needs to be a built in exemption for research. There is a new wave of GIS users – open source, publishing. Cy – I think you are right and we have thought about that, that may very well affect what we

do 3 or 4 years from now but it's going to be awhile before we can incorporate that into what we are doing as an enterprise. I am attempting to incorporate pieces of open source components where it's feasible into the things we are doing, particularly the web applications, but it's going to be a while before we can really incorporate that fully. While we have to be in this environment it makes sense to standardize this product for enterprise purposes that are listed in this rationale, but keeping in mind we have to do this.

Unknown source - Shouldn't there be a built in policy with out having to go the exemption route? The national trend is moving toward open source. ESRI sees open source as a threat. How does this tie into ESRI on price breaks when they are actually going to see that as a big negative to a price agreement with the state if you are allowed to do other applications and open source, and why would we agree to this before we know what ESRI's price structure might be, do we actually know that? Unknown source - No, we can't know that, we probably won't know that until we have something in place so it's kind of a catch 22, but the open source part of this, I absolutely agree that is where things are headed and that's where we need to go, but as I said, it's going to be awhile. I can imagine open source applications being developed and software being used that would work fine with an enterprise environment that has ESRI as a standard, but there could be other applications that could be built that wouldn't work and that would cause problems so if we just granted an open exception, we could get ourselves in a mess. I'd rather see some kind of a process where we could at least review what's going to happen and know what's going to happen rather than just allowing an open blanket for open source. This might be something where we need to have a different modified process for that.

Motion made and seconded to endorse the proposed process for declaring ESRI the state GIS software standard. The rules process gives ample opportunity to get stuff out like open source.

Jim - I'd like to add a sentence of exemption for research applications – it's not a business.

Bob – OWRD - Will this have a state license like OUS for state government? Why do we need a standard to do this? Cy - ESRI won't give us a significant price break or state license without a standard. Some counties are not on ESRI and they must have other software products because they are not ready at this time. Some departments are going to request exemptions from this because they have 2 dozen licenses of other software manufacturers who don't have maintenance fees and they're moving into nibbling on open source products. The price break is one thing but the other thing ESRI and Cy talked about is the idea of having a site license like OUS has, for state government and that would be where we would put one amount of money on the table and have unlimited access for the software for a two year period of time and then we'd review and evaluate how much software we used and how much money we would need next time. ESRI is not willing to do this without a standard. Using rulemaking as a tool is clumsy at best. Rulemaking doesn't capture the essence or recognize the broader problem that we are

seeking to manage with respect to setting this as a standard. We need to be adaptive so we're not captured. Question called – motion passed.

NavigatOR – Lindsey Ball, Kris Kautz

The Governor just approved the requested \$5M for navigatOR in his budget. Now, we have to get this approved through the legislature. We need to put together information and we are going back to the POP that you folks approved; that POP and narrative have more detail in it and we'll be pulling some extraneous information out of there and putting some more detail in, like control of the project, how it will be controlled, who will be managing it and what will the oversight be. Those are things they are interested in. This is the start of a 183 million dollar business plan, but we do not expect to get that from state government. We expect to get about 30 million dollars from state government and then leverage the rest with other investments. The data sharing partnership is a critical piece of that because we can't leverage money from feds or private sector if we can't share the data with them. We have to be able to work through those issues and do it quickly. We won't be able to work through those issues with everyone, but we will with a lot. We've probably got 20 counties and the cities within those counties that, if we can work through the risk and liability issue, we'll be able to get them on board fairly quickly. The other 14 – 16 counties will be tougher. They have more reason not to trust and more issues and fewer incentives. We may want to leave out the statewide wording. BAM has asked that this not go forward at all unless everyone knows that this is a larger project. This is the first money that will be asked for.

The 8th Framework Standards Forum

The 8th Standards Forum recently took place. Gail Ewart went over the Forum material. Data stewardship was discussed and concept and ideas were shared on how to handle data stewardship along the entire life cycle of the Framework data. Work from the Framework implementation team was shared. They had 4 standards presentations. Discussions took place on resolving data sharing issues. More and more people are being brought into leadership slots as efforts mature to that point.

Consent Agenda

We have four standards, two that were approved in the 7th standards forum 6 months ago. Wording change will be made on Floodplain standard by changing the word “are” to “may”. Motion made to approve consent agenda – motion approved with modification. We are developing a convention for the amendment process and Gail has suggested an approach so you'll be seeing that on the next agenda – we'll have a standards amendment process.

Imagery for the Nation

The Imagery for the Nation link has been posted with the idea that Congress is being asked by a lot of people around the country to fund Imagery for the Nation. The proposal is very detailed and a lot of states are lining up in support of this and this is what we've been asked to do is support this as a Council. We'll probably want to buy up to higher resolution for various areas of the state. In 2005, we formed a consortium and bought

\$1.5M of imagery for \$200K. That was a pretty good deal and this is the same concept at the national level. There is no cost to us unless we buy up to higher resolution. There is no obligation by endorsing it. Motion made and seconded. We need to make this clear that this does not obligate us directly for financial contribution but we have an interest in potentially buying up in order to gain. But that is discretionary action on our part so that we can get more out of this. We need to understand what we are affirming here – So we'd say Whereas Oregon may be interested in buying up to a higher resolution for certain portions of geography – we are not committing in this document for that purpose. That makes what we are affirming clear. Friendly amendment made to the motion and motion passed with one abstention.

Meeting Adjourned