

June 11, 2008
OGIC
Draft Minutes

Attendees: Dean Anderson (Polk Co.), Malavika Bishop (DEQ), Jim Bucholz (DOR), BG Mike Caldwell (OMD), Brady Callahan (OPRD), Duane Dippon (DOI BLM), Gary Gipson (OED), Laer Haider (DHS), Milton Hill (GEO), Vicki McConnell (DOGAMI), Rob McDougald (ESRI), Jim Meacham (UO OUS), Terri Noble (OMD), Dugan Petty (EISPD), Dave Ringeisen (ODOT), Rick Schack (DOR), Sheri Schneider (USGS), Mike Schuft (ODF), Greg Sieglitz (OWEB), Randall Sounhein (DSL), Bob Swank (LCOG)

Imagery Briefing and Proposal ~ Cy Smith & Milt Hill

Cy and Milt handed out a proposal to the OGIC attendees detailing a proposed course of action to acquire imagery for Oregon government needs.

<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/ogic/imagery-2010-20080602.pdf>

Discussion:

- Without knowing what the SDC storage and hosting costs will be, how will an agency know what the costs will be in the future and how will agencies allocate the funds?
 - We have an agreement that we won't be charged directly for the storage and hosting costs this biennium. Right now, those costs are unidentified and spread across their customer base. No one is fully clear on how much the expense will be. GEO has three distributed servers used for the Spatial Data Clearinghouse that cost approximately \$30,000 per year total. The Imagery Explorer portal uses another three distributed servers, in addition to 300GB of SAN storage. There will be a cost for those three servers, the SAN storage, and perhaps networking charges.
- What about returning the hosting of this information to OSU instead of the SDC to save costs?
 - The infrastructure is already in place. There is data being housed and accessed now. The proposal is to buy more imagery which translates into more data that runs through that infrastructure. The question isn't should we move it, although that may be worth looking into, but how much the hosting will cost.
- Is the SDC in the position to tell us how much the hosting will cost?
 - That discussion between GEO and the SDC still needs to take place.
- Are we approaching the proposed imagery acquisition in the right way? How should costs be allocated for the new imagery? We will have to pay more, to the tune of about \$450,000, for buy-ups including CIR and half-meter resolution.
- GEO will conduct a survey to determine needs for buy-ups. The survey is the key. Through the survey, we may find out that IR isn't that important to everyone, half meter may be what everyone wants. The IR might not be important enough to spend money on.

- Are you going outside the normal FIT approval process? If so, is it appropriate to ask OGIC to make a decision to circumvent the normal approval process through FIT?
 - Yes, we are circumventing the FIT approval process to commit \$49,000 of Framework development funds for 2010 imagery. We have an opportunity here that presented itself in the last 2 weeks. If we send this through the FIT approval process, there is a potential to not get the answer in time to have an impact on federal decision-making. We would have to bring this to OGIC for a decision regardless.
- Do you have any idea how much different agencies use the imagery now?
 - The OGIC agencies typically use the imagery quite often. We don't have an idea as to which agencies are using it and how much.
- How would an agency know what their cost is going to be?
 - The simplest way would be to divide the cost based on the same ratio we use for the assessment. It wouldn't be spread across the state, but across the agencies that participate in OGIC and a few others that don't participate but should be part of that based on usage.
- Are you talking about a specific assessment to capture this or use the model to be able to bill the agencies?
 - We would use that model to tell the agencies at this table the appropriate amount to have in their budget. It's based on the size of the agency and the importance of geography to the mission of the agency. If ODOT or OGIC puts more money in, each agency would owe less.
- The feds need to have a firm commitment of funds by December 2009.
- The state budget process is pushing us to act on this proposal now.
- There is time to refine the proposal, figure out the costs involved and work with FIT on where the dollars might go in terms of buy-ups.
- GEO will lay out costs for different agencies via email and collect responses via email.
- Is there time for FIT to be part of the process? If we could do it in the next 2 – 4 weeks, we could have the kind of impact we need to have on the federal government.
 - FIT, PAC and GPL proposal came out of the Orthoimagery Framework meeting. FIT might say they will spend more money from the assessment on imagery.

OGIC passed the motion to come up with \$49,000 through allocation or the FIT budget process, send a letter of support to the federal government and come back to OGIC to work through other issues and specific dollar amounts.

Action Items:

GEO will talk with the SDC and find out how much the storage and hosting fees will be for this data.

GEO will prepare and email a detailed proposal on different cost options following the meeting with FIT in the August timeframe.

GEO will work with Fiscal, in DAS, to see if money in existing budgets can be carried over to spend later.

GEO will send a survey to agencies regarding this proposal.

GPL Report ~ Brady Callahan

Data sharing and storage is critical to GIS. At this time, the SDC does not have a mechanism to bill agencies for shared services; they can only bill the agency that is storing the information.

- GPL members see bottleneck at the SDC. Is there some way OGIC can use its pull to help with this issue? How can we expose this problem?
 - OGIC can weigh in to escalate this issue with the SDC, if we know specifically what it is.
- We need to underscore the importance to reduce costs by sharing information. Isn't the sole purpose of the SDC consolidation of data and equipment?
 - Yes. They are working towards getting there.

OGIC passed the motion to develop a resolution encouraging the SDC to accelerate the process of consolidation of GIS data and equipment, and to develop a rate or cost model to appropriately spread the cost of shared data and services among the user agencies.

Action Items:

*GPL will put together a one-pager about the specific issues they are having with the SDC
GEO will develop a draft resolution as per the approved motion; Dugan will send to SDC*

Data sharing update ~ Rick Schack & Dave Ringeisen

Rick Schack, from the Department of Revenue gave an overview on the progress being made on tax lot data sharing between county and state agencies, specifically related to the funding provided by OGIC for tax lot data sharing.

<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/datasharing/CadastralDataFrameworkLayer-StatusReport3-08-3.pdf>

- The Agreement between DAS and DOR to transfer funds is near completion
- The Agreement between DOR and counties will take more time to develop language that is acceptable to all participating counties.
- Is there a timeline on the Agreement between the Department of Revenue and the counties?
 - We are hoping for the end of the calendar year, at the latest.

Dave Ringeisen, from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), gave an update on progress ODOT has made on road data sharing.

<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/datasharing/TransportationDataFrameworkLayer-StatusReport3-08.pdf>

- ODOT is collecting data sets from cities, counties and various agencies and integrating the information to create a statewide road network
- ODOT plans to use the University of Oregon to come up with agreements within the state between ODOT and individual local government road authorities
- ODOT is creating a road network to route vehicles for emergency management
- There are 48 contributing agencies sharing data on all their roads within their county/cities with the State right now

Framework proposal review process ~ Milt

Milt showed the Framework review process proposal to OGIC from a sub-group, comprised of members from GPL, FIT and PAC. The sub-group is proposing a process for making recommendations to OGIC on how to spend the \$500,000 in assessment money received from all agencies for Framework data.

Discussion:

- The selection criteria, technical evaluation criteria and policy selection criteria have already been developed?
 - Yes, by the FIT, GPL, and PAC, respectively
- Does the proposal lock these three groups in to the review process or will that be subject to change?
 - Adjustments can be made. What we are asking for is approval of the process flow and of the timeline.
- Will the criteria be approved/driven by OGIC, and should it be?
 - It can be, if OGIC wants to do that.
- Who has the authority or responsibility to revise those criteria?
 - OGIC may not need to worry about the criteria. OGIC appoints members to these three groups, so they should have people OGIC trusts. It might be more appropriate for OGIC to discuss and determine the priority of spending, rather than spending a lot of time going through the criteria.
- The criteria should be published so nothing is hidden.
 - The criteria will be part of the proposal submission paperwork.
- We can review and amend the process after we go through it once to make sure it works.
- The pre- and post-review is comprised of GPL, FIT and PAC members. GPL and FIT should do the pre-review and then PAC should get it to do the post-review, come up with the business plan/process and then give it to agencies. It would smooth out the process to have PAC sign off on this and make a recommendation to OGIC. The way it's designed now, there may be OGIC disagreements which may delay the process.

- In the interest of moving the proposal forward, we should amend the flow to move PAC down to the post-review in the process and leave GPL and FIT where they are.
- Since all three groups have a veto power, what's wrong with having them review and approve or deny at the same time? That may speed up the process time and leave specific groups to deal with their specific issues. All groups carry an equal weight on veto power. If someone gives a no vote, the proposal can be revised and re-submitted.

OGIC passed the motion to approve the Framework proposal approval process with the proposed revision: Move PAC down below GPL and FIT for the post review and retain the vote from GPL or FIT to be able to revise and re-submit proposals.

Action Items:

Milt will send the selection criteria documents to OGIC via email

Business Plan Action Items:

Cy will send GEO's business plan to OGIC members over the next month and OGIC members are to review GEO's business plan and send comments back to Cy

GPL reviewed the business plan and had serious issues, according to Brady. GPL will meet in 2 weeks to go through the business plan line by line. If you'd like to attend that meeting, let Brady Callahan know.