



# Meeting Notes

## GIS Vision Workshop

March 12, 2003

9:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

California Resources Agency, 1416 9th St., Room 1412,  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### MEETING PURPOSE:

To determine requirements for policy, resources, priorities and council structure to achieve the original vision.

### MEETING GOALS:

1. Identify and prioritize the most pressing policy issues and problems in government that rely on the availability of quality spatial data and GIS.
2. Determine the appropriate Advisory Committee organizational structure to support these needs and priorities.
3. Agree to next steps and resources.

### PARTICIPANTS:

Donna Hansen (City of Modesto and League of Cities)  
Keith Boggs (Stanislaus County and CSAC)  
John Huie (Contra Costa County)  
Secretary Grantland Johnson (Health and Human Services)  
Secretary Winston Hickox (Cal EPA)  
Clark Kelso (State CIO)  
Undersecretary Mike Sweeney (Resources)  
Secretary Maria Contreras-Sweet (Business and Transportation)  
Tal Finney (OPR)  
Dallas Jones (OES)  
David Peterson (NASA)  
Chuck Johnson (Bureau of Reclamation)  
Tony McKinney (Fish & Wildlife)  
Jayne Handley (USFS)  
Ken Osborn (USGS)  
Jim Sims (SCAG)  
Paul Page (Federal Dept. of Transportation) – by phone

Mitzi Higashidani (Health and Human Services)  
David Illig (Health and Human Services)  
Brad Kane (Business and Transportation)  
Esteban Almanza (OPR)  
Jim Watkins (OES)  
Gary Arstein-Kerslake (Cal EPA)  
Kevin Terpstra (State CIO Office)

#### Staff and Guests Attending:

Ray McDowell (Resources)  
Brian Smith (CalTrans)  
Christie Marshall (OPR - Innovation in Government)  
Rick Updegrove (OPR - Innovation in Government)  
Genevieve Giuliano, (USC and CSU Long Beach)  
Martha Tate-Glass (Caltrans)  
Linda Roberts (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service)  
Warren Barres (Dept. of Managed Health Care)  
Joel Bush (Office of State CIO)

#### Key Advisors

Luree Stetson (Resources)  
John Ellison (Resources)

#### Facilitator:

Lisa Beutler, Center for Collaborative Policy

### KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

#### Why We are Here Today, Why We Should Continue

The group shared their perspectives regarding the need to move forward on GIS.

#### *Local Partners*

KEEP GOING: With regard to the Council, focus on the Council's mission. It is this Council's commitment to a sustained effort. With regard to statewide issues, there is a need for standards and to move GIS forward.

RETHINK THE QUESTIONS: The Council creates a forum to discuss what local government can bring to the table. Local government would like a more active partnership with the state and needs a structure to do this. There is also a need to improve coordination at the local level and expand the vision at the local level. The Council effort provides a level of exposure that will “connect the dots.”

#### *State Sponsors*

NEED TO MOVE FORWARD: The group identified a number of mission critical activities that had GIS dependencies. These ranged from the need for good information and early engagement to achieve Resources’ core mission, to GIS being a life-saving tool. There is a need to have standards and share data and a need for GIS for long range planning. Simply put, having GIS data results in better decisions.

PLACE MATTERS: Place is where people engage in activity. If people are isolated, service delivery is difficult. We need to use data strategically to design programs and need to use data on a daily basis to administer programs. Along these lines we should also look at how GIS is used for decision making. There should be a focus on sustainability and indicators. The Environmental Goals and Policy Report (EGPR) offers a structure that frames questions in this way.<sup>1</sup>

RELATIONSHIPS: GIS is all about empowering communities and state officials by providing information. We need to be working with local governments

NEED FOR A LONG VIEW: GIS Infrastructure will enhance ability to deliver services. Not realistic to expect immediate results. Infrastructure is a strategic investment.

#### *Federal Partners*

CREATION OF NEW VALUE: There is a need to understand environment at a global level and transfer knowledge to local and state government. There is a need for an integrated structure of governments to work on this. Thinking about GIS needs to extend beyond public lands.

GET IT TO THOSE THAT NEED IT: One federal representative noted he had spent 20 years in getting GIS into the hands of people who need it to do their jobs. This activity is critical to management of functions ranging from environmental protection to homeland security. The need for coordinated action is well demonstrated by recent events at Folsom Dam.

REAL AND PRESENT NEED: Homeland Security (HLS) Mapping has jumpstarted other mapping efforts as demonstrated by the USGS collecting imagery for 133 cities nationwide.— This process is dependent on using state and local data. There is a need for a coordinated structure to address this.

#### Where We’ve Been

*“GIS coordination is not for the faint of heart.”*

The Key Advisors provided background on key issues and what has transpired to date focusing on “how shall we bring disparate local and state efforts together in a decentralized state?”

The GIS Council was noted as a step forward but a variety of limitations in the previous structure impacted overall effectiveness. Now homeland security has raised new issues and created new priorities. New information layers – non-physical layers, like demographics and socioeconomic data – are needed. USGS has identified 7 layers of data essential to everyone (e.g., framework data).

There is a critical need for a governance structure that includes an implementation process/team. Regional Councils are looking to state for leadership, coordination, and cohesion. There is also a need to develop statewide GIS, but the state cannot do it alone. We need the Council and regional Councils, and collaborative efforts. We need to bring people together to change the way we do business.

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary Hickox offered an example of how this should be considered and suggested reading about a similar situation in Education – “Last Gasp” in 12/15 Fresno Bee

Where We Need to Be

Emphasis:

Begin with the end in mind, WE WANT TO MAKE DECISIONS THAT IMPACT THE QUALITY OF LIFE.

The GIS collaborative structure should be:

- Networked, decentralized abilities with emphasis on regions
- Place based
- Sustainable
- Focused on a few key strategic activities
- Advocacy and understanding by elected officials
- Supported with staff and \$\$

Several key considerations must be in focus as the group moves forward:

**Comment [RM1]:** Bullets under Structure don't show up when you print the file. You may want to slike the column over slightly

POLICY	STRUCTURE	PROCESS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIS is a tool, not an end in itself. Government is in a crisis of credibility. We need to use GIS to show government is effective in making a difference in people's lives.</li> <li>• We need to take a longer view on how we use and collect data. Our clients/customers are self-organizing, self-regulating groups. Our current stovepipes don't reflect this reality.</li> <li>• "Not Invented Here" is out the window. Partnerships and data integrity are the key. However, too many elected officials don't see the potential for using GIS as a tool. This creates a tension between technology and policy.</li> <li>• Policies needed on what data to release. (Both may come from Dallas.)</li> <li>• Environmental justice sets an analytical framework. We need to know the consequences of policy decisions. Thus, there exists significant overlap between EPA and HHS. Without both, can't make the connections between public (and private!) health decisions (i.e., obesity, cardiovascular disease, etc.). The three pillars of public policy are Economy, Equity, and Environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to keep GIS leadership group small to be effective.</li> <li>• Need strong state-level commitment.</li> <li>• The CURRENT hierarchical structure of the GIS Strategic Plan interferes with a partnering, collaborative model.</li> <li>• Need to have priorities for action</li> <li>• Decrease complexity of organization. Look for extended action by topic specific subcommittees and regional councils.</li> <li>• Post on web and provide metadata. (In the long run, this is where the technology is heading. It will result in less need for standards.)</li> <li>• Need a small internal pilot project to provide focus. Use just the water part of the EGPR.*</li> <li>• Consolidated effort may result in Homeland Security (HLS) funding being available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solve problems, create more efficiency</li> <li>• We need a central organizing principle (such as EGPR- AB 857) to create focus.</li> <li>• We must work together. Council's role is to get all levels of government on the same page. We need to be respectful of our partners.</li> <li>• Go for core goals and have small successes.</li> <li>• Need to have an administrative statement from the Governor: letters to the Agencies to share data and provide resources.</li> <li>• Establish a cost sharing process (ala Contra Costa).</li> <li>• Are there any appropriate opportunities to partner with the private sector?</li> </ul>

*"We are Data Rich but Info Poor."*

DATA ISSUES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverage existing databases and add geo-coordinates. Don't always build from scratch.</li> <li>• We will find we have "holes" in our data sets. Also, we have lots of data, but little information.</li> <li>• There is too much duplication of effort in acquiring and maintaining data. The cost of this is</li> </ul>

## DATA ISSUES

substantial. For example, eliminate duplication with aerial photography flyovers – much room for efficiency here

- The business needs and types of decisions drive the granularity of the data.
- Need to share data and set standards. (Although CMCC and FGCCC do this, it isn't "official" and there is no mechanism for adoption and promulgation.)
- Create an inventory of initiatives to allow piggy backing. (This grows out of data sharing and standards) and complete work on the 7 framework layers.
- Solve problems, create more efficiency
- Do not get overly encumbered with managing the compatibility of data and setting rigid standards – "think search engines & spiders." The technology is rapidly improving and some issues will be resolved that way.
- Consider development of standards based on "lowest common denominator." Ask regions to outline what is most doable based on current state.
- Do not charge others for data, instead find ways to share data.
- Come to terms with the limitations of sharing existing data. There are many "urban myths" as to what is and is not available and in what form it exists.
- Do not create data dependencies that could actually preclude data access (for example – do not embed information in a restricted database as might be found in homeland security). Resolve in advance of partnering.

## TO DO

1. Steering Committee plus Key Advisors to propose a more collaborative Governance Structure
  - Create a real partnership with equal representation of the government sectors and specifically local governments.
  - Focus on subcommittee and regional structures to accomplish actual work, use the Council as a leadership and direction body.
  - Determine regional council gaps and create a strategy to fill gaps.
  - Refocus the strategic plan to reflect goals above.
2. Key Advisors to move forward on a joint GIS effort to create focus.
  - Utilizing the EGPR as a framework, define and create a pilot effort in conjunction with OPR<sup>2</sup>.
3. Eliminate Barriers to State Agency Data Sharing.
  - Dallas Jones to assist Tal Finney in creating a letter to Agencies from Governor that breaks open the information bottleneck and emphasizes data sharing.
  - Key Advisors to recommend a way to better utilize CMCC and FGCCC to provide staffing to effort.
4. OES (plus G. Vincent and Clark Kelso) to Define HLS needs that may be compatible with this overall process and serve as a potential interim funding source for activities in support of HLS.
5. Key Advisors to develop protocols for providing and receiving information from the Web based system ([www.gis.ca.gov](http://www.gis.ca.gov)) now in place. Group to establish better communication about this resource to create more utility. A variety of issues, including access to some information must be addressed (see #4 above). OPR has expressed interest in linking this with other portal issues.
6. State Advisors to consider appropriate funding and staffing measures as part of overall action on GIS. This will likely involve some dedication of existing resources to targeted projects or roles.
7. OPR to create checklist to help State Departments meet AB 857 requirements.

<sup>2</sup> Jim Watkins suggests that we should use a PMI structure for this. There should be a Project Charter, an Executive Sponsor, and a plan that addresses cost, personnel, time, scope, risk, and procurement, etc.