

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council



Meeting Date: March 15, 2017

Time: 10:30am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Attendees: Chair: Jim Rue, DLCD; Cy Smith, GEO; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Eric Brandt, LCOG; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Phil Smith, ODOT; Terri Morganson, Esri; Arron Heriford, DHS/OHA; Tom Elder, DHS/OHA; Janine Salwasser, OSU/INR; Eric Hiebenthal, BLM; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Merri Seaton, DOR; Daniel Stoelb, OEM; Ken Smith, OWRD; Jed Roberts, DGMI; Malavika Bishop, DEQ; Brett Juul, ODOT; John Prychun, DOR

Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Cy Smith at 10:30am.
- Minutes from December meeting were approved.
- No additions to the agenda were made or requested. Janine announced that the new Oregon Explorer website, developed with assistance from LCOG, would be launched in conjunction with GIS in Action on April 18. Cy presented a certificate of appreciation to Randy Sounhein for his work as GPL Chair for the last two years.

GPL Report – Phil Smith

Shared services conversation has continued at GPL, as to how state agencies could work together better. The Project Portfolio Management tool that DAS has implemented for the Stage Gate process is too complex for this purpose, but GPL would like to find a collaboration tool that would help agencies track and coordinate their work better across the enterprise. BLM has a tool that may work, GPL will evaluate it in the next few months via a work group.

Phil has been talking to GEO about updating the GPL web page with the idea of making it a GIS leaders tool box. They are now talking at GPL about the idea of having a collaboration tool available through the GPL website. That concept should be better defined by the next OGIC meeting. One of the items that should be available on the new GPL website will be the Esri deprecation schedules and other software-specific information.

GPL has established a coordinate system subcommittee to work on the upcoming change from NAD83 to a new horizontal coordinate system version in 2022.

Quite a few state agencies have brought up at GPL their move to away from Esri's ArcPAD and to other mobile field data collection software and devices, such as Esri's Collector and Survey123. There is interest in having a mobile data collection work group started as part of GPL. Phil is talking with Terri Morganson at Esri about how Esri can help us with training and education on this software, taking advantage of their work with agencies in Washington, getting a couple of workshops set up in Portland for Oregon users.

GPL is also talking about migration plans related to ArcGIS desktop software, from their current

products to ArcGIS Pro and to their online software-as-a-service tools, ArcGIS Online and Portal. Cy mentioned that GPL is also talking about having some additional training opportunities related to this migration, as well, starting with self-directed classes and then following up some online, instructor led classes as needed. Ken Smith mentioned that we need to be sure we are getting this kind of training when it's needed and not before. Agencies are on different timelines for this, which makes training collaboration more difficult. But bottom line is that an agency shouldn't take the training before they're ready to actually start making the transition. Dean Anderson said he could provide to anyone that wants it their internally developed comparison of the strengths of ArcGIS Pro, for comparison with existing ArcGIS desktop versions. Several said they would be interested in that. Dean can provide to Phil to distribute to GPL.

Framework Data Report – Theresa Burcsu

We have a new HazardsFIT lead, Ed Flick, Marion County Emergency Management Director. He brings a lot of great experience to the table. OGIC voted unanimously at this meeting to approve Ed as HazardsFIT lead. They will be having a meeting soon, as will the GeoscienceFIT group.

The FIT leads and Theresa have been working to prepare the FIT funding solicitation, which has included getting the solicitation written, the evaluation criteria established, and defining the prioritization criteria. Part of the work has been defining foundational Framework data elements, which are elements that form the basis for most other Framework data sets. As such, the FIT leads have determined that they want to place a higher priority on completing those elements, which will mean that a larger percentage of the FIT seed funding will go toward those foundational elements in this upcoming budget cycle. The FIT leads are finalizing their work on this over the next month or so, in preparation for releasing the solicitation document.

Theresa mentioned that there have been a few key changes to the FIT funding RFP. Proposers will be required to submit a brief abstract with their proposal. That abstract can be used with successful proposals to help others understand the proposal and will potentially generate more interest in collaborating on the project after the seed capital and existing leverage has been assured.

To ensure that the non-foundational data elements aren't left out, a certain amount of the FIT funding will be dedicated to those elements and the selection criteria will be nearly identical to the criteria for the foundational data elements. The percentage to be spent on non-foundational data elements from the total FIT funding will be 30%.

The budget section has been standardized, so the reviewers can more easily understand that information. There will also be a stewardship section in the proposals, so that the reviewers can understand at least what the process is expected to be for defining a stewardship plan for a proposed data element, if one doesn't already exist. This may involve simply proposing the appropriate manner in which stewardship should happen, even if the proposer isn't the ultimate steward for the data set they are proposing to develop. Such a proposal would ultimately be handed over to the FIT lead and work group for a data set so it could be solidified and more fully developed.

Theresa indicated she is still seeking feedback on the draft solicitation document and will continue to seek feedback even after the document is released, so it can be continuously improved over time. The solicitation may be ready for release in time for OGIC to approve awards at the June meeting, barring any unforeseen difficulties or feedback that needs to be addressed prior to release.

Question was asked about why we are using a gmail account for submission of proposals instead of a state email account. Theresa said she would change it to a state account to avoid possible issues.

Theresa asked if OGIC would consider adopting a policy regarding a cap for overhead expenses on FIT projects. Cy offered a proposal to cap overhead for FIT projects at 15%. If OGIC has a policy in place, we can probably insist on following that policy, but we could also make exceptions on a case by case basis. BLM indicated that 15% might be a problem for them, but the difference might be acceptable as in-kind. Theresa has an action item to prepare a policy for OGIC to review for the next meeting, if not sooner.

Remotely Sensed Data RFP – Brady Callahan

Brady missed his son's 3rd birthday to report on this item. The ImageryFIT has been trying to figure out for a number of years how to initiate a cyclical imagery program. We have relied on federal imagery data for many years in the absence of a cyclical state program, but that imagery has not been adequate to meet many state agency and local government needs. The ImageryFIT held a number of meetings with stakeholders and sent out a survey to help determine needs for statewide imagery. An RFP was developed based on that input and a qualifications-based selection process will be followed to select a vendor, with which we will negotiate price. There are two primary objectives for this RFP: 1) high resolution statewide imagery; 2) a hosting/storage solution for that imagery and the historical imagery and possibly additional local government imagery.

We asked for options for 6 inch imagery for the benefit of local governments. The statement of work was posted on the OGIC website for the group to review. Brady said to send him comments after the meeting, if any come from the review. The contract or price agreement developed from this RFP will likely be a multi-cycle agreement, probably for at least three two-year cycles (6 years).

Cy indicated that this RFP and contract process is going through the Stage Gate process with the Office of the State CIO. GEO (Theresa specifically) developed a project plan with a variety of project planning artifacts, all of which have to be reviewed and approved by OSCIO. That got us through Stage Gate 2, which allowed us to release the RFP and make a selection. We have to put the funding together and produce some additional documents to get Stage Gate 3 approval, which will allow us to sign a contract and start the work. We don't yet know what the work will cost, so we haven't made a lot of progress with funding. We intend to get to the contract approval stage by the end of this biennium.

National Geospatial Issues – Cy Smith

The National Geospatial Data Act was released in the 114th Congress in the Senate and House. The Senate bill was introduced by Sen. Hatch and Sen. Warner, and both Oregon Senators co-sponsored it. It has now been reintroduced in the 115th Congress as S.1253. The House version has not been reintroduced yet. The intent is to bring on co-sponsors in both Chambers in a bi-partisan manner, and they don't have a Democratic co-sponsor in the House yet.

Cy has been the primary negotiator in getting to the final language on the bill for both Chambers, negotiating with the Management Association of Private Photogrammetric Surveyors around some procurement language they wanted to insert and the definition of geospatial data to be included in the bill. The bill provides for Congressional oversight of federal agency geospatial spending.

Cy said that one example of duplication at the federal level is that DHS purchases 60 copies of CoreLogic parcel data for their agency, at \$100,000 per copy annually, because they aren't allowed by the company to share the data, even within the agency. That sort of duplicated spending is happening in other agencies. The money that could be saved just from eliminating that kind of duplication could help fund data development and data sharing at the local and state level.

The bill also authorizes the Federal Geographic Data Committee and sets out its duties and responsibilities for geospatial coordination federally and nationally, and authorizes the National Geospatial Advisory Committee. FGDC is currently authorized by a Presidential Order and an OMB Circular, and NGAC is an advisory body for the FGDC. The bill gives them statutory authority to have more control and influence over federal agency geospatial activities. It also directs them to form more and better partnerships with state and local government to develop and share geospatial data. That will likely mean more federal funding for geospatial programs at the state and local level in the future.

The Digital Coast Act has been introduced in the 115th Congress, has been passed out of committee and awaits a vote on the Senate floor. The House version hasn't been introduced yet. The bill provides for geospatial data and tools to improve community resiliency for coastal communities. Much of the funding for this bill would come to State and local governments through NOAA. It creates a line item in NOAA's budget for the Digital Coast program. It hasn't had a line item before.

The 3DEP Elevation program has helped Oregon with a few hundred thousand dollars for Lidar data. USGS developed a business case for the 3DEP program and convinced Congress to support the program with funding. The plan is to have an 8 year cycle to fund Lidar data nationwide.

Address points were recently added to the list of nationally recognized Framework data sets by FGDC. This will help Oregon as we try to develop a statewide address points Framework data set.

Bills called the Local Zoning Decisions Protection Act (S.103 and H.R.482) have language in Section 3 that seeks to place a prohibition on the use of federal funds. The bills say, "Notwithstanding any of provision of law, no federal funds may be used to design, build, maintain, utilize, or provide access to a federal database of geospatial information on community racial disparities, or disparities in access to affordable housing." There's a lot of national discussion on these two bills. The discussion is primarily saying that it's wrong-headed to say that geospatial data won't be shared. Both bills are stuck in committee and are unlikely to move. But this language could show up elsewhere, so the national geospatial community remains vigilant.

Janine mentioned that many libraries around the country are moving to archive federal geospatial data they hold. She asked if it makes sense to do that in Oregon. Cy mentioned that communications with the legislators that introduced the bills has indicated those two bills won't go forward.

Cy mentioned that the Coalition of Geospatial Organizations has started developing the second iteration of the NSDI Report Card. COGO is working with FGDC this time to develop metrics for each of the Framework data themes. The Report Card will be published in February or March 2018.

Data Sharing Legislative Concept – Sean McSpaden

House bill HB2906 has been introduced in the Oregon legislature. It authorizes the Oregon Geographic Information Council, requires all public bodies to share geospatial Framework data with each other in a secure manner, authorizes the State Geospatial Information Officer and the Geospatial Enterprise Office, and establishes a geospatial data sharing fund. It wasn't possible to assign the bill to the committee that introduced it (JLCIMT), so the bill was referred to the Joint Committee on Ways & Means. Rep. Nathanson, the bill's primary champion, is the co-Chair of Ways & Means, so this is a good place for the bill to be.

Hearings will be scheduled, but meanwhile the Stakeholder Group will be asked for input on any possible amendments they would like to see. The summary Sean provided to OGIC is posted [here](#).

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Next Meeting

June 21, 2017, 10:30am - Noon
Conference Room A, Executive Office Building
155 Cottage St. NE, Salem, OR 97301

DRAFT