March 27, 2008
Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC)
Draft Minutes

Attendees: Ed Arabas, EISPD; Ben Berry, ODOT; John Byers, ODA; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Randy Dana, DLCD; Bob DeVyldere, WRD; Duane Dippon, BLM; Gillien Duvall, OEM; Gary Gipson, OED; Laer Haider, DHS; Milt Hill, EISPD; Jeannette Holman, DSL; Sandy Jefferson, ODF; Trygve Larson, OPRD; Shannon Marheine, OEM; Jim Meacham, OUS; Rob McDougald, ESRI; Terri Noble, OMD; Dugan Petty, EISPD; Rick Schack, DOR; Sheri Schneider, USGS; Angela Skyberg, EISPD; Graham Slater, OED; Cy Smith, EISPD; Bob Swank, LCOG; Joseph Toland, FEMA/GIS; Diana Walker, ODA; Rudie Watzig, DOGAMI.

Dugan welcomed everyone to the OGIC meeting and introductions were made around the room.

Stewardship Formalization ~ Milton Hill
Milt Hill gave a presentation on Stewardship formalization. Stewardship is "the willingness to be accountable for a set of business information for the well-being of the larger organization by operating in service rather than being in control of those around us". The Stewardship charter will formalize and create a process to identify stewardship activities. The charter document was developed by a work group over the past year and was presented to several groups. Since the last meeting, the Stewardship charter for the county boundaries layer was filled out. Milt received mixed messages when retrieving information from various agencies on the county boundaries. This resulted in several productive meetings with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) around the county boundaries and existing roles. The charter document is similar to a statement of work, with boiler plate language and signature lines, as well as being simple and generic. There are companion pieces being worked on, such as a Web-based form. For complex and involved Framework layers, business rules and standard operating procedures documents will be included as part of the Stewardship charter. This document is on the Website for everyone to read.

Motion to adopt the Stewardship Charter was made, seconded, and approved.

Data Sharing Partnership Task Force ~ Cy Smith
There was discussion at the December OGIC meeting on the December Data Sharing Partnership Task Force meeting. During that discussion, Cy said he was going to reach out to counties for further input. OGIC asked the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) to come back with a report. The Task Force had a meeting February 15, as a follow up to the December meeting. They fine-tuned a new approach to data sharing and shared that approach with the PAC, which endorsed it. The ideas that came out of the December and February Task Force meetings were that governance structure and more formal data sharing protocols are needed. If we are going to have a partnership, it needs to be something we can count on over the years. This Task Force is serving as the Partnership governance structure for now. There are three main issues we need to work out:
- Equitable membership in the governance structure
- Subcommittee to deal with operational issues
- Appropriate connections to OGIC

The Task Force is comprised of staff from ODOT, DAS, and DOR, in addition to approximately 10 local government representatives. We do not have a firm recommendation on governance at this point. The Task Force felt we needed to take small steps and get the data-sharing going to build trust. The two data sets we need to push forward quickly are tax lots and road centerlines.

DOR and ODOT are leading the efforts, respectively, on those two data sets and were asked to come up with an action plan to describe what has happened up to now and next steps. There are two reports posted on the Web. Cadastral (tax lots) is the Measure 49 issue discussed at the last OGIC meeting.   EISPD and several local government Task Force reps worked out a way to use tax lots on the web for Measure 49. There are no protocols on this, but we had to develop procedures due to the short timeframe of M49. We need to learn some lessons from M49 and develop protocols and processes that really work. There are three phases to the proposed new approach to developing a Data Sharing Partnership:

- Phase 1: Tax lots and road centerlines
- Phase 2: Include federal agencies (keep data sets out of the public domain if appropriate)
- Phase 3: Broader sharing of data with the public, as appropriate.

There are no timelines set for completion of phases 2 and 3. Cy hopes phase 1 will be completed by the beginning of next year. The approach to deal with specific lines of business and build partnerships within those lines of business is, fundamentally, a sound approach.   Relating to the federal agencies side, an activity behind the scenes already happened because the tax lots in Oregon have been shared with the US Forestry Service specifically because of the wildfire season. Cy sent a letter to all County Assessors explaining the purpose of the information being given to USFS. Nearly every county agreed to that. That set a precedent that could potentially be built on. The business processes need to be identified. The Task Force identified aerial imagery, LiDAR, and geospatially-enabled Census data as the top three priorities to be provided by the State in a data sharing partnership. OGIC's financial support is needed to make that happen. The thorny issues with the M49 data sharing activity were all about liability in sharing the tax lot data on the web for the public to use in making determinations on M49 claims and how to proceed. EISPD, DLCD, and DOJ worked with the local governments on a disclaimer. Liability is one of the top three issues to be resolved for data sharing. Efforts will continue to resolve liability issues through administrative or legislative means. EISPD is not planning to do anything legislatively in '09 because we do not have a concept ready to move forward. Cy hopes that OGIC will agree that it's important to endorse this new data sharing approach and to provide Imagery, LiDAR, Census data as our part of this partnership.   The consensus from OGIC is to keep moving forward.

Recommendation:
Include some language on funding and confidentiality in the Task Force document, as an incentive to local governments and to let them know we are aware of these issues.

GIS Program Leaders (GPL) Report ~ Brady Callahan
This is the second in a regular series of reports from the GIS Program Leader chair, Brady Callahan. Two issues from the Geographic Program Leaders (GPL) group are:

- The ELA
- The GIS Software Standard

The GPL is concerned about the delayed implementation of the GIS Software Standard and the effect it is having on the state and local GIS levels. They are seeing project delays due to the delay of implementing the GIS Software Standard. GPL also feels there needs to be an increase in the number of GIS services offered and hosted by GEO. As part of the navigatOR concept, GEO is providing access to data sets and developing geospatial services. The technical expertise for this exists at GEO, but they may need additional hardware or storage space to provide robust geospatial services. GPL expects that users will be able to tap those centralized services from their individual agency locations. The message Cy's hearing regarding navigatOR is not to wait to get funding for the entire program, but do smaller projects as the funding is made available. There may be funds from other areas that could be pulled together to help move forward more

quickly. OGIC has dedicated two full time staff for web and data development. Specific recommendations for OGIC are needed from the customers.

Action Items:
GPL will discuss the issues around funding and resources around navigatOR and bring a report to the next OGIC meeting.

Framework Implementation Team (FIT) Report ~ Milton Hill
GEO is responsible for distributing assessment funds to Framework data developers. At the December FIT, GPL, and PAC meetings, fundamental changes were discussed as to how assessment funds for Framework data development are distributed.   An ad hoc process was used for the 07-09 biennium so we could get the development projects underway. But for 09-11, we need to figure out a way to reconcile feedback from all three groups to make the process more equitable and objective. For 07-09, OGIC received and approved the proposed distribution of funds via email. For 09-11, WRD and ODF suggested a process that was used as a foundation and a work group was developed with representatives from GPL, PAC, and FIT, as well as EISPD staff. This has taken a bit longer than what was originally anticipated. A revised funding process should be presented at the June OGIC meeting for review.

GEO is responsible to lead the community in developing data standards. ODFW created the Fish Habitat Distribution Standard and brought it to OGIC today for approval.   This approval is a requirement before ODFW will get funding for their proposed 07-09 Framework data development project. There was a half-day workshop hashing out the details and making necessary changes to the Fish Habitat Distribution Standard. It was distributed to PAC, FIT, and GPL. This was also discussed at the standards forum in Corvallis. Sandy Jefferson felt further definition was needed on the attributes. Brady directed her to an additional page that had these additional definitions included.

Motion to adopt this standard was made, seconded, and approved.

GIS Software Standard ~ Dugan Petty & Cy Smith
We expected to have the GIS Software Standard adopted by now, but it was delayed due to a potential collaboration with Washington. We finished exploring that possibility and are in the process of working through the procedures to implement the standard. EISPD anticipates adoption soon. Three things we have to do before we put the standard in place.
- Address the response and feedback received on the standard
- Develop a GIS software inventory mechanism
- Develop exception process in a collaborative environment

Cy suggested OGIC assign exception process development to a workgroup. GEO and other sections within EISPD would do the support work. There was an inventory done for the navigatOR Business Case in 2005. This inventory might be more extensive than that. This would be an inventory of all GIS software. Bob Devyldere from WRD made the point that the enterprise license and the software standard were related topics. He said he believed that the standard discussion/process was started to help with the economic aspect of using GIS software and if the business problem is being handled in another way, maybe we don't need to develop this standard. Cy pointed out that there are economic and technical reasons for developing this standard. The technical interoperability benefits alone will make the standard worthwhile. EISPD wants to make sure we have collaboration on this and OGIC members that would like to be involved will be involved. Brady Callahan asked how this inventory will play into the formalized process of a standard that DAS has already gone through. Ed Arabas responded that

the inventory in the rule is set up to anticipate the exception process. People will declare the state of their GIS environment at the beginning and that will grant them relative immunity during the exception process until something changes in their implementation. Brady asked if DAS sponsored training would be available for the exception process. Dugan told him that typically, that is what we do and we will figure out how to implement it.

Action Items:
EISPD will be in charge of developing and implementing the inventory tool
EISPD will establish a collaborative process with agencies to develop the exception process
EISPD will determine what kind of training component is needed

ESRI Enterprise License ~ Cy Smith & Ed Arabas

The discussions have begun regarding the ESRI Enterprise License Agreement (ELA). Cy spoke with ESRI to indicate that we are almost ready to negotiate with them. ESRI will send us a sample enterprise license agreement. During these informal discussions, ESRI indicated flexibility on how to structure payment for this ELA. They do not necessarily need a lump sum payment at the beginning. If we negotiate in the next several months, ESRI will give credit for the monies already paid in the interim by agencies. Administering a license agreement won't be a simple task. There are some issues with support calls. Right now, every agency that buys software has the ability to call ESRI for support. ESRI wants to negotiate a smaller number of people who are identified to call in and the other agencies would work through them. The next steps to take and timelines are not exactly clear, but we have to get SPO involved. SPO will do the actual negotiating and Nic Betsacon, formerly with SPO, now with ITIP, will work with SPO on our behalf. OGIC would like Cy to put a timeline on this process. Cy doesn't believe ESRI is opposed to having the ELA apply to local governments. Typically, SPO has cooperative purchasing agreements with local governments; if they do this as a price agreement, it should be available for local governments. As conversation with SPO takes place, EISPD will explore making the ELA available to counties. OUS has an enterprise license with ESRI and the negotiations will be interesting as far as OUS being a part of this.

Action Items:
Cy will put out a timeline for the ELA implementation
Ed Arabas will e-mail Jim Meacham to get the name of the manager at OUS to help their get their experience involved in this

Response to December Storms ~ Joseph Toland

Joseph Toland, GIS Leader from FEMA, presented the GIS support for the 2007 winter storms. Their program supports multiple areas and jurisdictions. Joseph showed pictures and maps of the disaster recovery areas, hot spots for flooding, and wind damage. The Core of Engineers completed a new flood study, which showed major differences than the one done in 1988. There were 30 families from Vernonia needing temporary or permanent housing assistance after the flood. The mobile home program was implemented and was able to help these 30 families get back on their feet.

Contacts:
Logan Monroe is the regional coordinator and long term contact for the GIS community.
Joseph Toland can be reached at joseph.toland@dhs.gov

.

Roundtable

Ben Berry met with the State Procurement Office (SPO) regarding GIS position classifications. They are trying to inject these classifications into the Managed Service Provider (MSP) contract. They were successful to a degree with those that are not the senior level resources. They can secure resources to existing level 4 rate through the existing contract, about 75% of the time, but can't secure a higher level due to the rate structure in the MSP. This would not have an impact on our own classifications. This would just affect the contractor's.

Is there a desire/need to have a new procurement instrument for GIS classifications at higher levels that are not able to be included in the MSP program? Would OGIC endorse the need for this or not? This wouldn't have an impact on our own classifications.

Action Items:
Cy will e-mail members of OGIC to see if there's a perceived need within the agencies to get this level of service, which means another contract by SPO specifically targeted to MSP for a higher level of GIS. The question is do we combine the effort or have separate ones? What do agencies have the need for?