

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council



Meeting Date: September 14, 2016

Time: 10:30am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Attendees: Acting Chair: Cy Smith, GEO; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Jimmy Kagan, INR/PSU; Bob Sheldon, Esri; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Jacob Edwards, DOGAMI; Jes Mendez, OED; Michael Gurley, OEM; Matthew Taylor, DOR; Robert Mansolillo, DLCD; Ken Smith, OWRD; Bill Clingman, LCOG; Eric Hiebenthal, BLM; John Prychun, DOR; Nathalie Smith, Esri; Tanya Haddad, DLCD

Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Cy Smith at 10:30am.
- Minutes from June meeting were not available. March minutes were approved after revisions.
- No announcements or additions to the agenda were made or requested.

GPL Report – Randy Sounhein

GPL discussed the idea of developing and maintaining a project portfolio of state agency GIS projects. There is some potential to use the DAS Project Portfolio software tool to enable this. Such a portfolio management approach would likely help with the GIS shared services initiative.

GPL has been discussing GIS shared services for some time. Questions still haven't been answered as to direction, etc. Randy suggested that it would be good to have a webpage to provide information about GIS shared services so everyone has the same information. Cy indicated that GEO staff would put a webpage together for this. The webpage will document the shared services pilots that are ongoing, and will be a place to capture shared services information going forward. It was clarified for OGIC that this is about state agency GIS activities, trying to coordinate better among agencies, using staff resources more effectively.

GPL has also been discussing the Oregon Coordinate Reference System, and potential impact of changes and improvement.

Oregon Coordinate Reference System (OCRS) – Brady Callahan

SB 77 was enacted in 2011 moving management of Oregon's coordinate reference systems out of statute and into administrative rules, related to ODOT, making it easier to change the reference systems as needed.

Provisions in the OAR gave ODOT the authorization to create an advisory committee to oversee and administer the coordinate reference systems. OGIC was asked to provide an advisory committee member to replace our previous member, Matt Taylor (DOR), whose term had ended. Brady was appointed to the OCRS advisory committee for OGIC.

The advisory committee convenes when changes to the coordinate reference systems are desired. The committee was convened in August 2016. The committee was asked to add 20 zones to the

low distortion coordinate reference systems that are already mentioned in the OAR. Rationale for adding them is to fully cover the state with low distortion reference systems. The committee recommended endorsing those 20 new zones be passed to the Transportation Commission for approval at the Commission's December 2016 meeting.

As part of the endorsement process for the 20 low distortion reference systems, the question was raised as to whether there was interest in adding the Oregon Custom Lambert coordinate system to the OAR, thus referencing that system in statute. So the question for OGIC is whether to ask for Oregon Custom Lambert to be added to the OAR.

Brady brought this issue to GPL first. There was a positive response from GPL, along with a few questions about ramifications for existing Framework and other data. Brady indicated that the impact would be quite low and perhaps non-existent. Brady indicated that he believes OGIC should ask GPL to review the issues and come back to OGIC with a recommendation in the next few months. The issue of adding the Oregon Custom Lambert system to the OAR is not going to be taken to the Transportation Commission in December.

Brady said there will be no requirement to use any particular reference system in the OAR. Brady indicated that the way the Oregon coordinate reference systems are specified is by a generic datum, not a specific realization. OGIC agreed to ask GPL to review the issues and implications and come back to OGIC with a recommendation on this item. Jimmy also asked GPL to consider if having the Oregon coordinate system in OAR would make it difficult to switch to the metric system if the U.S. ever decides to make that switch in general.

Question was asked as to whether there is already federal guidelines on coordinate reference systems and datums, and whether this would have an impact on our work with federal partners. Eric indicated that he didn't think this would add any problems with such work, and that he thinks adding the Oregon Lambert system to the OAR would be a good thing.

Aerial Imagery Approach/Phodar – Brady Callahan, Cy Smith

The Imagery Framework Implementation Team and GEO are evaluating procurement of 1 foot resolution statewide aerial imagery, with 6 inch resolution imagery for many urban areas. We have about 35 TB of imagery at the data center, but we are struggling to keep up with the data and infrastructure. We can't easily add more imagery now, and we are currently sitting on 2012 and 2014 imagery that can't easily be accessed by anyone.

The cost of imagery and cloud storage have decreased, and there is an opportunity to collaborate with local governments at a higher level of resolution that will meet everyone's needs. We have been doing market research on the options for over a year, and have recently undertaken development of an RFP that would provide options for a collaborative approach with federal, state, local, regional, and tribal governments. We would pass the hat to collect funding for this procurement this time around, but we would include this cost in whatever OGIC proposes to the Legislature in the 2019 session for a funding model.

The imagery would match the NAIP specification, and we would try to partner with the NAIP program (USDA) if possible. The procurement would likely be a multi-year acquisition, which would allow local governments that have already purchased imagery recently to participate. The agreement would like be a three year contract.

Phodar is produced by collecting point cloud data from aerial imagery. It can serve as a substitute

for Lidar in areas where high density elevation data is needed but Lidar will not likely be produced due to high costs, such as much of southeast Oregon. It would be better than the 10 meter DEM data that we have now statewide and is much less expensive than Lidar. It would match the new imagery we are proposing with the procurement mentioned above. OPRD is testing some phodar samples now. DOGAMI has also been testing phodar. One of the differences with Lidar is that you only get surfaces with phodar, not bare earth or other variations. The RFP may include phodar as an option. We do need to have a standard for phodar so that the data that is created is high quality.

Data Sharing Legislative Concept – Sean McSpaden

Sean McSpaden handed out v8 of the draft data sharing legislative concept, which was the latest version posted on the Data Sharing Work Group website. The work group has been working on this concept since April 2016. Drafts are shared with the full Work Group, then posted to the website. The latest version shared with the full Work Group will be the one posted to the website at any given time.

The concept has not yet been reviewed by Legislative Counsel, so the words will likely change before the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology (JLCIMT) decides whether to introduce it as a proposed bill. Sean walked through a summary of the concept, including the major effects of the concept, to inform and educate OGIC.

There were some questions and comments about the concept from OGIC members. Sean asked OGIC members to email him or Cy with specific questions, comments or concerns so he could bring them to the Work Group for further discussion and response. Randy Sounhein asked if the Work Group had thought about asking all state agencies if they were interested in having a representative on OGIC. Jimmy Kagan and others pointed out that that would be impractical and would potentially increase the size of OGIC exponentially, as it would also be necessary to ask all local governments, federal agencies, etc. if they were interested in having an OGIC representative. The concern was that only one state natural resources agency would be represented on OGIC in the new structure, even though state natural resources agencies have been the drivers behind much of OGIC's activities up to this point.

Cy pointed out that the thought process behind the OGIC structure in the concept came from the idea in the existing OGIC strategic plan that we have to have equitable representation on OGIC if we want to change the way the funding model works now. If we want local governments and others to help with funding OGIC activities, like Framework data development, clearinghouse operations, etc., they have to have an equitable seat at the table.

Brady Callahan asked if the concept meant that each State sector that had a seat at the table would be expected to provide the same level of OGIC funding, e.g., education would provide as much funding as natural resources or public safety. That concern/question will be taken back to the Work Group to consider, but the idea behind equitable representation was not intended to reflect precisely equal funding provided by every sector in any given timeframe.

Brady asked if there had been discussion by the Work Group about the existing OGIC committee structure. Sean indicated that the FIT was specifically called out because the concept is primarily about sharing Framework data, and the Work Group felt that structure needed to be called out at a minimum to ensure it remained. The rest of the structure will likely be established in a charter so we don't lock in a structure that couldn't be changed until the next legislative session. It was mentioned that there are at least 9 members of the current OGIC on the Work Group, including the current OGIC Chair. Dean Anderson also mentioned that the FIT structure was called out partly because

there's quite a lot of Framework detail that the Work Group couldn't or shouldn't establish in the concept, and they wanted to be sure there was a structure in place to work on that detail right away. Brady indicated that he had some concerns that arise because it was difficult to see what the total impact of this concept would be on the geospatial ecosystem that currently exists.

Sean mentioned that there would be a possibility of a state government geospatial committee that could be part of the new structure, which would be one way of ensuring that all state agencies felt like they had a voice in the Council. Cy spoke briefly about the dangers of this approach, as several other states had something similar and that the state government committee and the overall Council in those states were frequently at odds with no mechanism to resolve conflicts. However, some means of addressing this concern will need to be found and is likely going to be part of the Council's charter development.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04pm.

Next Meeting

December 14, 2016, 10:30am - Noon
Agriculture Building, Basement Conf. Room
635 Capitol St. NE
Salem, OR 97301