

RECAP

Meeting Name

Meeting Date: December 18, 2013

Time: 10:30am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Attendees: Cy Smith (DAS~GEO), Diana Walker (ODA), Rachel Smith (DOGAMI), Jim Meacham (UofO-OUS), Eric Brandt (LCOG), Dennis Ruth (OMD), Dave Ringeisen (ODOT), Cindy Lou McDonald (BLM), Dean Anderson (Polk Cnty), Gail Ewart (DLCD), Vicki McConnell (DOGAMI), Brady Callahan (OPRD), Andrew Booth (Marion Cnty), Malavika Bishop (DEQ), Janine Salwasser (OSU-INR), Keith Moen (OEM), Lee Otis (ESRI)

CIO Staff: Pamela Larsen, Bob DenOuden (DAS~GEO)

Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes – Dugan Petty

- Meeting was called to order by, Acting Chair, Cy Smith at 10:32am.
- Minutes from June meeting to be reviewed and approved; delay to end of meeting.
- New State CIO, Alex Pettit, will Chair the next meeting.
- Add to Agenda: GIS Projections – Brady Callahan
- Cy will send out new OGIC Meeting Schedule for the next two years; 3rd Wed quarterly

EPSG Projections – Brady Callahan

Brady is representing a sub-committee of GPL to look into a problem with the international body that administers coordinate projections information for use by software applications. The problem is that there are multiple projections that were supposedly endorsed by OGIC that are in the repository and are creating problems for various users. The sub-committee reviewed these and presented recommendations to GPL to clean up the projections by removing several that are not needed. GPL approved those recommendations. The recommendations are being presented for approval by OGIC. Motion made to follow recommendation from the GPL related to the EPSG projections, motion seconded, motion passed unanimously.

GPL Report – Rachel Smith

GPL has had 5 (five) meetings since the last OGIC meeting. Rachel presented a summary of data themes discussed: Rural fire protection districts, Beach access points, Cadastral data use/sharing agreements, Critical facilities data, ODOT data sharing and 2010 Water Quality Assessment database. Summary of other topics discussed: how agencies discover, discuss and implement new technologies, morale in the workplace, GIS training opportunities, FIT proposals/projects, ESRI user conference & NW GIS User Conference, EPSG codes (official state GIS data projections), ArcGIS Online (AGOL) implementation, hardware recommendations, other software use-GeoCortex, AGOL Governance group, GIS Day (Nov. 20th), Oregon Lidar Consortium (new acquisition projects and current lidar holdings) and use of ISS Series Classification for GIS staff.

Esri ELA and other GEO Activities – Cy Smith

ELA extension executed October 1, 2013, it runs through July 1, 2015. One part of the ELA is unlimited AGOL user seats and 30,000 credits per year for a total of 60,000 credits. Within that we re-initiated the EEAP which is the Training aspect with 100 more training credits. AGOL user seats can be given out or sold to local governments, as well as state agencies. There's a small Governance Team of 5-7 people that will put together recommendations about how to charge for the seats and provide those recommendations back to GPL, PAC and OGIC. They meet for the first time January 3, 2014.

OGIC approved in interim, since the last meeting, the last of the FIT projects, an imagery project to acquire 2012 NAIP imagery and improve management and access for all statewide imagery.

Consent Agenda: Map Element Standard Revision – Cy Smith & Bob DenOuden

The Map Element Standard was endorsed by GPL and sent to OGIC for final endorsement. ODOT and OUS representatives at OGIC indicated they still had some issues with the standard. There was brief discussion, and OGIC agreed to send the standard back to GPL, with ODOT and OUS to send suggested revisions to Rachel in the next week or so.

Data Sharing Policy Discussion - Cy

Cy presented a one page document , available on the OGIC website at http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/CIO/GEO/pages/ogic/ogic_meetings.aspx, that summarizes the data sharing activities that OGIC and GEO have undertaken with the geospatial community over the past 7 or 8 years. Cy indicated that, despite all these efforts, data sharing between government agencies and with the public is not what it should be. Last effort was development of legislative concept and effort to resolve issues with various stakeholders. At the end of the day, no agency was willing to carry it to the Legislature.

Comment made that legislation is probably necessary and that takes a while. We made a good start last session, but it will take more time. Depending on what data is under consideration, the data sharing impediments seem to be different. There are three primary data sharing impediments that government agencies cite for not sharing: funding, liability/risk, and privacy/confidentiality. Some have all three issues, some only have one or two.

Question asked as to what we're trying to accomplish, are we looking for funding, or are we trying to offer some solutions to the liability and privacy/confidentiality impediments. Some counties have resolved the data sharing issues, partly by being self-insured and partly by copying data sharing policies and processes from others that had already developed click-through license agreements. OGIC probably can't resolve the funding issues.

Legislative concept last session was built around data sharing for public safety purposes between government agencies involved in that business process in some way. May be a problem with leaving some government agencies out of the mix. There's also a potential problem with the 911 centers being funded by OEM to improve or create geospatial data which is not always in the public domain.

Another possible way of narrowing the scope of data sharing legislation would be to limit it to Framework data, which is comprised of ~250 data elements. As far as risk/liability, the State could take on additional risk on behalf of the local governments that could help resolve that impediment. There's an ownership issue in that some agencies hold and use data for which other agencies are

the custodian. Statute defines data custodian as the authoritative entity that initially created the data, they are the owner and are responsible for disseminating it, other agencies that have it can't be compelled to provide it to others. That has an impact on any 'open data' effort that might be undertaken. The concept of authoritative data would need to be addressed in any legislative concept. The liability for misuse of data is tied to custodianship by statute, so disclaimers and other methods for limiting liability for custodians after the data is shared may not actually hold up in court.

There could be implications for the funding that flows now from OEM to 911 centers for data development, where the 911 centers get funding for data that they acquire from other government entities, but that funding doesn't often make its way to the authoritative source.

Direction from OGIC at this meeting is that some enabling legislation is needed. Cy will modify the previous legislative concept, perhaps with some options embedded for ways of dealing with a few key issues, and present that back to OGIC for review. Depending on timing, Cy may need to set a placeholder for a data sharing legislative concept for the 2015 session. Need to determine if the Universities would be included or excluded from proposed legislation.

Address Standard Adoption – Bob DenOuden

Didn't get to this item, will hold for next time

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Next meeting:

March 19, 2014

10:30am - Noon

155 Cottage St. Conference Room A