

**Oregon GIS Program Leaders (GPL) Meeting
January 8th, 2008
State Archives Building – Salem**

Present: Brady Callahan, OPRD; Sheri Schneider, USGS; Laer Haider, DHS; Malavika Bichop, DEQ; Mark Sanchez, DOGAMI; Ken Kato, UofO/OUS; Rudie Watzig, DOGAMI; Emmor Nile, ODF; Joe Bernert, OED; Ashley Seim, OWEB; Bob Harmon, OWRD; Terri Noble, OMD; Carl Anderson, OMD; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Rod Therriault, DOR; Phil McClellan, DOR; Milt Hill, DAS/GEO; Dennis Scofield, ODOT; Phil Smith, ODOT; Jon Bowers, ODFW.

Scribe: Milt Hilt, DAS/GEO and Joe Bernert, OED

Handouts: none

Agenda Topic	Discussion Summary	Result	Action Req'd Yes/No	Resp. Party
Introductions	Self Introductions	Informational	No	
December Minutes	Approval of December 2007 Minutes. No comments	Approved	No	
Announcements	DAS/GEO to host the February Meeting. Tentatively at the Revenue Building Room in the Fish Bowl Room (confirmed)	Scheduled	Complete	Milt
	March Meeting at OWEB. OWEB will make a short presentation on GIS at the agency.	Scheduled	Yes	Ashley
FIT Proposal General Discussion: Lead by Brady - with input from all	<p>Review of last meetings discussion on GPL role of providing technical review of the Framework Implementation Team (FIT) proposal for data development.</p> <p>Process: GPL, Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) & FIT provide input to the Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC). GPL's primary role is the technical review). FIT and PAC have completed there reviews.</p> <p>FIT has email reviews and posted on the web related information.</p> <p>PAC met 1/8/08 in the morning and completed their review. Three primary guidelines were discussed: 1) no funding of data standards development, 2) does the proposal develop a framework dataset? and 3) no new portal development. The focus is on data development activities. PAC recommendations were posted for GPL's review.</p>			Emmor & Dennis
FIT Proposal Review Process Discussion: Consensus	<p>Since limited technical information was provided in the proposals it was determined that a complete technical review was difficult.</p> <p>The group recommended that a process be established to assist in the future to allow more technical information to be presented in the proposal</p>			

Interest	that Cy discussed two related data development efforts at the morning PAC meeting: 1) MCH GeoPoints (http://www.mchgeopoints.com/places2protect.html) and, 2) A homeland Security initiative developed by Technographics (http://www.tgstech.com/) that will be available to public agencies free of charge.			
Soils	Proposal was to use an approach similar to geology to build a best available statewide soils dataset: Using SSURGo, Statsgo, BLM, Forest Service, etc. PAC recommended pending standard being presented prior to work and clarification on the product delivered.			All review
Hydrography	Funding focus on development migration to framework clearinghouse. Local to national posting process. Incorporation of Lidar data into hydro theme. Discussion of whole stream identifier and federal move to National Hydrographic Dataset (NHD). Clarification on amount broken out by task was requested.			Questions answered by Bob – All review
Wetlands	Complete 250 National Wetland Inventory (NWI) quads to complete the statewide coverage. Question as to whether the \$100k funding (external OWEB) was firm. This is still questionable. Discussion of hydrography and wetland relationships. This is a jurisdictional topic.			Questions answered by Ashley & Randy – All review
Transportation	Although a lot of text was provided the deliverable was vaguely defined. Completed statewide road coverage with address ranges available to all agencies by the end of 2008 is to define in the deliverable (as per PAC discussion in the morning).			Questions answered by ... – All review
Fish Passages	PAC recommended this proposal as a do not fund because they did not believe it was a framework layer. This was defined as a framework layer and a standard was presented at the last forum. More detail was requested on what was version 1 data set, timeline and the specifics of the funding and deliverable.			Questions answered by Jon – All review
Fish Habitat	Discussion of presenting the data standard prior to funding (i.e. March Forum). Technical discussion on habitat (ODF&W) and presence (ODF) fisheries habitat. Discussion of life stage (Rearing, spawning and migration) for species (Chinook, Coho, Chum and Steelhead). Current users of the dataset and vintage of data to be included were reviewed.			Questions answered by Jon – All review
Climate	Question as to whether the data was publicly available. Review and discussion of the methodology was OSU/PRISM is the leader in this approach. Unknown leveraging of funds and unknown widespread use of the proposed data.			All review
Cadastral	Tentatively the funds would be to allocate \$1,000 to each county for cadastral data to be available to statewide agencies. No clear definition as to whether the county will agree but a straw poll suggests 27 counties may agree. Based on recommendation from Cadastral Framework data group. Question as to the counties that have not provided Goal II data. Contracts between Revenue and Counties would be put in place. This is			Questions answered by Phil – All review

	expected to be repeated annually.																																																																									
Public Land Survey System	PAC recommended removing all software (ArcIMS). Questions as to whether AOC would pursue without software. Discussion on how to improve communication and relationships between the GIS and Surveying community.			All review																																																																						
NavigatOR	Discussion of how this was not a framework activities.			All review																																																																						
Ranking of Proposals	<p>Each agency was able to vote for each proposal on the technical merit related to the agency. Each agency had 5 high votes, 4 medium votes and 4 low votes.</p> <p>The results are presented below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Proposal</th> <th>High</th> <th>Medium</th> <th>Low</th> <th>Rank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hydro</td> <td>13</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadastral</td> <td>11</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wetlands</td> <td>11</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Geologic</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transportation</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Soils</td> <td>5</td> <td>8</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fish Habitat</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fish Passage</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PLSS</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Landslides</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Climate</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>8</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Points-Interest</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>10</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NavigatOR</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>11</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Brady will meet with Milt and Cy to discuss and prepare a recommendation to OGIC.</p>	Proposal	High	Medium	Low	Rank	Hydro	13	1	0	1	Cadastral	11	3	0	2	Wetlands	11	2	1	3	Geologic	7	6	0	4	Transportation	5	9	0	4	Soils	5	8	0	6	Fish Habitat	6	5	3	7	Fish Passage	5	6	2	7	PLSS	5	2	7	9	Landslides	2	5	6	10	Climate	1	4	8	11	Points-Interest	0	3	10	12	NavigatOR	0	3	11	13	Results presented here Emmor - Calculated	Yes	Lead by Brady all agencies voting Brady
Proposal	High	Medium	Low	Rank																																																																						
Hydro	13	1	0	1																																																																						
Cadastral	11	3	0	2																																																																						
Wetlands	11	2	1	3																																																																						
Geologic	7	6	0	4																																																																						
Transportation	5	9	0	4																																																																						
Soils	5	8	0	6																																																																						
Fish Habitat	6	5	3	7																																																																						
Fish Passage	5	6	2	7																																																																						
PLSS	5	2	7	9																																																																						
Landslides	2	5	6	10																																																																						
Climate	1	4	8	11																																																																						
Points-Interest	0	3	10	12																																																																						
NavigatOR	0	3	11	13																																																																						
Agency Reports	Agency reports were not presented due to lack of time.																																																																									
Side Discussions	<p>Two noteworthy side discussions were tabled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jurisdictional authority to enforce data share as per Oregon State statues and following up with the state's Attorney General (specifically related to state funding GIS data development and data sharing). 2. The trend of state agencies moving away ArcGIS Server as a solution due to cost of implement of software and hardware (via the State Data Center [SDC]). <p>Workgroups may be developed to pursue these topics. Will be discussed offline.</p>																																																																									