

Oregon Geographic Information Council

March 17, 2004

State Capitol, Hearing Room 350

Present: Cy Smith, DAS/GEO; Don Fleming, DAS; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Mitch West, DEQ; Gary Gipson, OED; Michael Dougherty, DOGAMI; Drew Bryan, OEM; Shannon Nesemann, OEM; Bob Swank, LCOG; Vicki Lucas, USGS; Nancy Tubbs, USGS; David Ringeisen, ODOT; Jim Bucholz, DOR; Bob DeVyldere, OWRD; Doug Terra, OWEB; John Lilly, DSL; Ray Jaindl, ODA; Dan Christensen, ODF; Gwen Grams, DHS; Gail McEwen, ODFW; Ken Bays, BLM

Scribe: Yvette Cardenas, DAS/IRMD; Tracy Loutzenhiser, DAS/IRMD

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action Req'd/ Result	Resp. Party
Introductions	Self-introductions followed Don Fleming's reiteration of the many benefits that can result from OGIC meetings and their decisions. Fleming was introduced as the OGIC Chair and also stated that the preliminary Business Case is on the website for everyone to view.		
Geospatial Information Infrastructure Business Case	Cy discussed the business case with the Council. The brief presentation will be posted to the OGIC web page at http://www.gis.state.or.us/coord/ogic/OGIC3_17_04.pdf The preliminary business case is posted now at http://www.gis.state.or.us/coord/PAC.html Cy Smith then asked the Council if the proposed business case steered the program in the right direction and if they approved in concept. Mitch West stated that he thought this should be coming from the agencies themselves. He thought that a \$30 million dollar budget is a great idea, but stated that this responsibility lies solely within the agency budgets. He made a suggestion that he would like to make this add-on to the OGIC budget as opposed to a part of the assessment fees. Cy Smith stated that the assessment would not go away, but could be minimized down the road. Don Fleming confirmed that the assessment would not be taken away.	Present the Business Case to this group at the next meeting	
05-07 OGIC Budget	Cy reminded the Council that he had sent them an email saying that, because there was a process requirement to provide a budget to DAS by a certain date, he had submitted the \$1.569M budget number as a placeholder. Don Fleming stated that the placeholder basically accounted for estimated future costs and inflation increases, but with data center consolidation, there is no way to accurately predict		

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action Req'd/ Result	Resp. Party
	<p>what costs increases or decreases might occur. Cy stated that it seemed like a more reasonable approach to include the maximum budget number as a placeholder, as it would be easier for agencies to decrease their budgets afterwards than to make increases. Cy asked if this approach met with the Council's approval for the short term, until the business case is finalized. There was general agreement.</p>		
<p>GIS Software Standard</p>	<p>ESRI – ArcGIS, ArcView, ArcIMS, etc. Justification is primarily purchasing power and enterprise data interoperability; recognizes de facto standard, 95% of Oregon State Agencies use ESRI. A motion was made and seconded to establish ESRI as the state GIS software standard. Discussion ensued as follows.</p> <p>Two paths for non-ESRI users: Exception process and withdrawal plan. Cy stated that there is an exception process in place for agencies that can articulate a business case for using something other than ESRI. If the business case isn't approved by the State CIO then they would be asked to submit a withdrawal plan for eliminating the use of non-standard software within a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p>What is the exception process? Cy stated that there is an interim policy in effect for software and an agency would have to build a business case for not using the standard software. He also stated that IRMD would be able to help the agency with the exception process or a withdrawal plan. Bob DeVyldere asked why we need a standard, why not just continue with a de facto standard, doesn't establishing a standard limit our ability to negotiate a good price with ESRI, and what about licensing issues?. Dave White would prefer to have this responsibility lie within the agency and their CIO's. Cy stated that once it was agreed upon then this decision would go to the CIO Council for discussion and decisions. Don Fleming stated that it would be his intention to have decisions about whether an agency should be granted an exception to the statewide standard made by the agency CIO, that as the State CIO he didn't believe he could add any value to the process.</p> <p>Revenue has a need to operate in both kinds of software and they need to be able to support both.</p>		

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action Req'd/ Result	Resp. Party
	<p>There was a question if the standard was only for state agencies; the answer was yes. Are there defined boundaries as to what constitutes GIS software? Have we included the cost of maintenance and ownership in the thought process? The comment was made that if we establish ESRI as the vendor then we might lose some of the bargaining power. Bob DeVyldere stated that we want to focus on the maintenance more than the software purchase price. DHS is concerned that the information they use is of a confidential nature, so that data interoperability isn't an important consideration for them. Gary Gipson at Employment is in a similar situation. He stated that State Agencies sometimes hide behind the confidentiality clauses that are of great significance to their agencies, but most of the time the information that is needed by other agencies is of an aggregate nature and not the actual confidential client data.</p> <p>Vicky Lukas from USGS stated that the feds are moving towards open standards and away from proprietary software. Cy stated that part of the issue is that he is not able to make a master purchase agreement with ESRI without establishing a standard, due to the state purchasing policies. Don stated that we should bring someone from Purchasing to have them explain the issues in regards to this. We can have someone from Silver Oaks, the procurement consultant, speak to the Council. Bob DeVyldere stated that with all this in mind there was still a motion on the floor to pass the standard. Doug Terra stated that we need to be aware of the strategic sourcing process. Don suggested that Cy set up a meeting as soon as possible with the Council and Silver Oaks, the strategic sourcing consultant. Cy agreed and suggested that an email vote on the standard could take place after that meeting. There was a suggestion to add a description of the exception process to the information provided prior to an email vote.</p>		
Framework Data Development Status	<p>The majority of the presentation to be posted at http://www.gis.state.or.us/coord/ogic/OGIC3_17_04.pdf includes the Framework status update.</p> <p>Hydro – recently went live with the hydro clearing house, a multi-state project; Trans – road centerline data is being integrated now by ODOT, which is modifying internal business processes to become the data steward; Cultural – addressing standard being</p>		

Topic	Discussion Summary	Action Req'd/ Result	Resp. Party
	<p>reviewed by committee and to be brought for endorsement at next forum on June 23; Imagery – 1 meter DOQs nearly complete (2000/01 vintage); committee meeting to finalize long-term plan for updates; Cadastral – statewide tax lot data nearly complete at a lower quality level (goal 2); Revenue modifying business processes to become the data steward. Geoscience – agreement in place with DOGAMI to compile 100K geology data for one-third of the state; Admin Boundaries – urban growth boundaries completed statewide by Employment; pilot project with Lane/Douglas being considered to complete all 17 tax districts; pilot would be extended statewide for tax districts; political boundaries already complete.</p> <p>Ken Bays gave an update on Geodetic Control with handouts.</p>		
New Business	None brought up.		