

**California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003**

Location:

Ziggurat Building
Executive Dining Room
707 3rd Street
West Sacramento, CA

Time and Date:

Wednesday, August 13, 2003, 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Agenda:

Introductions and Welcome	Former Co-Chairs: Secretary Mary Nichols Donna Hansen	10 min
Recent State Efforts	Jim Watkins, Deputy, OES	10 min
Where we are now	John Ellison, Resources AIO	10 min
Where we are going	Secretary Mary Nichols	10 min
Adopt Charter	Secretary Mary Nichols and All	15 min
Elect Chair and two Co-Chairs	Secretary Mary Nichols and All	15 min
Break	All	10 min
Joint Development of Council Initiatives and Priorities – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Results of Policy/Project Initiatives Survey ✓ Setting Priorities – Initial Results 	John Ellison Facilitated Group discussion	30 min
Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Council Initiative Project Charter ✓ Project Plan ✓ Next Meeting 	John Ellison and Deb Murata	30 min
Wrap-up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Were meeting objectives met? ✓ Assignments ✓ Parking Lot Items 	Secretary, Mary Nichols and Deb Murata	10 min

Introductions, opening comments, and presentations were made as indicated on the agenda (see attached PowerPoint presentation for details and list of invitees and attendees).

California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003

Charter Discussion:

Richard Mader – Expressed concern about 1) minimum of at least two counties required to become a Regional GIS council and 2) lack of requirements & instructions on how to become a RGC.

Mary Nichols – Indicated that a willingness to make the language about RGC requirements more permissive.

Liz Klute and Erich Seamons – Requested that the Council consider adding seats for cities (i.e., League of Cities designees). The City of San Francisco was particularly interested in participating.

Mary Nichols, Donna Hansen, and others – Expressed a desire to not expand the Council and preferred to have cities and other local entities represented and active on RGCs.

Dr. Jefferds – Supported the broad regional participation in the Council and described the importance of local representation. He was concerned about the inadequate number of federal seats on the Council and recommended that the Chair be a State-government only position and not rotated to federal or regional agencies. He was supportive of vice-chairs rotating among the federal and regional members.

Jim Sims – Suggested adopting Charter “as is” with the stipulation that the Council was giving the Steering Committee a directive to review the Council charter and add seats (i.e., more federal or city representation) on the Council as necessary.

Dr. Jefferds – Please add Office of the Military Advisor to the State list in the Council charter.

Bob Slobodian – Suggested that the council chair should always go to one of the State members due to the importance of state leadership in this area.

Mary Nichols – Indicated that while she was open to this, she had not thought of it and wanted to give the council time to think about this idea.

Mary Nichols – Staff and Steering Comm. will go back and look at the number of federal seats relative to the number of federal participants that have expressed an interest.

There was discussion as to the make up and role of Regional GIS Councils (RGC). As is noted in the council charter, the RGCs will be composed of representatives of “county, city and tribal governments, resource conservation and other special districts, private and public utilities, local colleges and universities and whatever private sector organizations the local government agencies deem appropriate.” The RGCs will be critical to the success of the council. It is essential that the RGCs be intimately involved

California GIS Council Meeting Summary August 15, 2003

in identifying needs and solutions. There will be more coordinating activity and real hands on work at the regional level than on the main council itself.

A number of suggestions were made for certain groups like cities, colleges and universities to have a seat directly on the main council rather than working through an RGC. California's size and diversity makes ensuring adequate local representation while keeping the number of participants on the council down to a workable size very challenging. The problem of how various local constituencies can or should be represented is a regional one and not something the council can address due to practical considerations. Council meetings will be open and representatives of local groups will have the opportunity to make their voice heard at both State and Regional council meetings.

It was finally decided that membership should remain as is for at least the time being until the council had an opportunity to see how its current structure works. It was noted that the council charter allows for changes in council membership.

Selection of Officers:

Mary Nichols and Donna Hansen offered to serve as chair and co-chair provided all were in agreement to give the new council an opportunity to get going. (Donna indicated that she would serve only one year). There were no objections.

Alan Mikuni indicated that USGS would be the co-chair from the federal agencies. Again, no objections were indicated.

The Officers are:

- State Chair – Mary Nichols (Sec. for Resources)
- Local/Regional Government. Vice-Chair – Donna Hansen (City of Modesto)
- Federal Vice-Chair – Ken Osborn (USGS for Alan Mikuni)

Priority-Setting Discussion:

John Ellison reviewed the results of the "Top 3 Policy/GIS Initiatives" survey. The objective of this exercise was to help the council determine what projects they might want to focus on as their next steps. The top 3 (by count) Datasets/Tasks were:

1. Parcels (digital parcel maps)
2. Transportation (detailed digital roads, and other transportation features)
3. Imagery (1-meter or better color imagery)

Richard Mader walked through what the potential important goals/items would be for a statewide imagery acquisition effort:

- Incorporation of what local governments want (i.e., 1-foot or better resolution imagery)

California GIS Council Meeting Summary August 15, 2003

- Clear State agency lead/champion to negotiate and coordinate a statewide imagery acquisition (program?)
- Clear understanding of what a reasonable budget and implementation time frame might look like – requires planning ahead to incorporate proposed funding in federal, State, or regional budgets (probably the earliest any agency could reasonably expect to plan for an effort like this would be budget year 2004-05)
- Description of business cases and benefits of coordinating imagery acquisition

Mary Tsui – There are clear benefits from partnering. We know that many State, federal and local agencies redundantly collect imagery over the same geographic areas for different projects/initiatives. We could significantly reduce imagery acquisition costs if we did a more effective job of partnering.

Jim Sims – We should be able to put together more effective collaboration/coordination frameworks to layout the geography (footprint) of proposed imagery acquisitions as well as synchronization of acquisition windows before we get to the budgeting and acquisition phase.

Mary Tsui – Suggested that, in order to facilitate more multi-party imagery acquisitions, we need:

- State Point-of-contact
- Federal State Point of contact
- A proposed/planned/existing imagery “clearinghouse”
- Better understanding of the refresh rate needs of ongoing/periodic imagery acquisitions by all levels of government

Joe Concannon – There is a catalog/clearinghouse (CERES metadata catalog/California Spatial Information Library) accessible via the GIS Council page, and regional/local GIS collaboration web pages describing ongoing projects in some regions. The more important need is to get agencies to use the catalog.

Joel Bush – We need the Council to consider adopting policy goals that state that we will coordinate in order to reduce data acquisition redundancy and reduce overall costs to government.

Liz Klute – We need to coordinate an inventory of regional data and set a time frame (i.e., NIMA/USGS Homeland Security survey of Bay Area).

Alan Mikuni – Perhaps the Council should consider using the federal interagency coordination model developed for the National Aerial Photography Program (<http://edc.usgs.gov/products/aerial/napp.html#description>)

California GIS Council Meeting Summary August 15, 2003

Chuck Johnson – We have some existing State and federal coordination forums (California Mapping Coordinating Committee and Federal Geographic Coordinating Committee of California). What would be most helpful would be policy directives from the Council and participating agencies that support their staff and encourage more to participate in the existing collaboration forums. We would also benefit greatly from better communication between technical GIS staff participating in the coordination forums and the program managers and agency directors.

Donna Hansen – Recommended that we focus on directing staff to 1) assemble an inventory of existing data and 2) develop and implement a communication/outreach plan.

Luree Stetson – Asked that we assemble a team to focus on Imagery and come back to the Council with a status report and potential acquisition strategy within 12 months.

Dallas Jones – Suggested that the Council consider the California Integrated Seismic Information Network (<http://www.cisn.org/>) coordination model. Create a model and standards and move ahead.

Chuck Johnson - What about hydrography (rivers, lakes, etc.), flood control datasets? This seems like a high priority dataset and potentially a “quick win.” We should take a look work done by CALFED and the Bay-Delta Authority and others.

Tal Finney – Can’t we establish a process for each dataset?

Rich Mader – Based on his experience with local and regional governments, the top 3 datasets from the survey are consistent with what he’s found.

Mary Tsui – Seems the Council should be focused on setting policy guidelines such as:

- Reducing the cost and redundancy of data acquisition; particularly Framework data
- Adopting the Federal metadata standard and completing metadata for datasets

Brad Kane – Expressed concern about data priority bias (based on his impression that most Framework data is Resources-centric).

Rich Mader – We really need comprehensive metadata to assess the availability and quality of existing spatial data. He would like the State (and GIS Council) help with metadata collection.

Joe Concannon – What are the goals of and business needs for collecting transportation data?

Donna Hansen – The City of Modesto needs detailed road and parcel data to help with its 5-year planning cycle.

California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003

Erich Seamon – How can we set policies and standards for data sharing (i.e., Emergency response)?

David Ilig – Are we proposing a workgroup for each priority dataset?

Donna Hansen – Can we focus on regional examples; say 3 or 4 related to Homeland Security?

Liz Klute – Local projects and a lead person/agency for each.

Brad K. – Encourage all to place their metadata at the “clearinghouse.” (CERES?)

Joe Concannon – It would be helpful to make examples of best practices documents available through a central website/clearinghouse. We need a group to launch and support this effort.

Rich Mader volunteered to lead a Metadata Workgroup or Team. Specifically, this team is to consider what are the issues concerning barriers to metadata creation and maintenance.

Martha Tate-Glass – CalTrans agreed to take the lead on a transportation data inventory and assessment. Several members (e.g., Dr. Jefferds) expressed a desire to include airports, railroads and other transportation facilities in this inventory.

Dave Peterson – Are we expecting these workgroups to prepare operational plans?

Bob Slobodian – Metadata creation isn’t a stand-alone task and is a foundation element to most/all GIS.

Tal Finney – Can we use the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, Environmental Goals and Policies Report as an initiative to rally a cataloging and clearinghouse effort around?

Dave Peterson – Aren’t we looking for strategic alternatives, not specific plans?

Donna Hansen – We want to take some small, achievable steps that the Council can focus on.

Chuck Johnson – One of the major ongoing problems is the lack of communication between and among GIS technical folks, program managers, and top agency managers.

Patrick Parsons – We need to start from the bottom up with standards setting.

California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003

Eric Haney – Regional collaboration groups really could use examples of MOUs, best practices documents, and metadata standards and tools.

Paul Veisze – Announced the upcoming Geographic Names Information Systems conference in Sept. 2003, and described the GNIS Council as a good example of a working group with existing standards and local, State, and federal participation.

Donna Hansen – Asked that the results of the GNIS conference be brought back to the Council as an information item.

Rob Ball – Perhaps the Council should consider forming the Technical Subcommittee as called for in the Charter to start addressing some of the priorities and issues discussed by the Council?

Joe Concannon – The California Geographic Information Association (CGIA) is willing to host regional meetings/conference calls; working in collaboration with the Council.

Ken Osborn – USGS is also willing to provide conference call bridges for Council meetings and workgroups.

Donna Hansen – Recommended that these groups should report monthly by e-mail to the council on their project. Reports by teleconference should be scheduled every two months so that interested parties can listen in on the progress reports.

**California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003**

Action Items/Workgroup Volunteers:

Item	Executive Sponsor, Lead & Team Members	Schedule
Metadata Team – Policy, standards, system(s) and procedures needed in support of comprehensive state metadata program.	Lead & Executive Sponsor – Richard Mader (Southern California GIS Users Group); Team Members – John Ellison and Ray McDowell (Resources Agency)	Project Charter by 09-15-03; Project Work Plan by 10-15-03
GIS Data Clearinghouse (Transportation) Team – Policy, standards, system(s) and procedures needed in support of a comprehensive state clearinghouse for transportation data.	Executive Sponsor – Brad Kane (BT&H); Lead – Martha Tate-Glass (CalTrans); Team Members – Joe Concannon (Sacramento Council of Governments), George Dondero (Gold Country Regional GIS Council), Allan Mikuni and Ken Osborn (URSG), Dr. Jefferds (Military Advisor to the Governor), and Joel Bush (State CIO)	Project Charter by 09-15-03; Project Work Plan by 10-15-03
Imagery Team – Policy, standards, system(s) and procedures needed in support of a comprehensive state program for the procurement and sharing of imagery.	Executive Sponsor – Dallas Jones (OES); Lead – James Watkins (OES); Team Members – Mary Tusi (Central Coast Joint Data Committee) and Alan Mikuni and Ken Osborn (USGS)	Project Charter by 09-15-03; Project Work Plan by 10-15-03
Bay Area Security Project Report – Presentation on the security and centerline stitching project being undertaken by Bay Area Counties and Cities to the Council as an example of a process the Council may want to apply to other regions.	Liz Klute (Bay Area Regional GIS Council)	Next meeting of California GIS Council (January/February 2004)

**California GIS Council Meeting Summary
August 15, 2003**

Revisions to Council Charter – Recommendations were made to change the charter to more accurately reflect actual federal membership and be less prescriptive as to Regional GIS Council formation.	State Key Advisors	Next meeting of California GIS Council (January/February 2004)
--	--------------------	--

Parking Lot Item:

The subject of Council funding was placed on the “parking lot” and not discussed further.

Next Meeting:

A specific date for the next meeting of the council was not determined but it was decided that the council will meet again in the January/February 2004 time frame.