CALIFORNIA GIS STRATEGIC PLAN PHASE 2: REGIONAL PARTICIPATION

Regional Workshop #6:
Hayward, CA
November 8, 2007

Prepared for:

California GIS Council &
California Geographic Information Association

Prepared by:

Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Baker

Prepared on: **November 20, 2007**

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 6
Hayward, CA

I. PREWORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS

A. Bay Area Regional GIS Council (Workshop Representation)

1) Regional Organizational Capacity
- Technology is not meeting business needs in networking, data exchange, data storage, software or hardware capabilities.
- Funding is considered minimal. One time grants are the only listed funding mechanism.
- There is no staff available to support GIS efforts. There are adequate volunteers.
- Strong executive support is often available.
- There is a formal process for project oversight.
- There is a need to implement policies that would facilitate data sharing.

2) California Spatial Data Infrastructure
- This region has none of the seven core framework and eleven California-centric data theme datasets available.
- The top 5 regional datasets this region would like to develop next are:
    - Cadastral
    - Ortho Imagery
    - Transportation
    - Street Addressing
    - Buildings and Facilities

3) Regional Implementation
- This region has used the Imagery for the Nation, the California Spatial Library, and the California Environmental Information Catalog, but not the 50 States Initiative.
- The establishment of a GIO is viewed as important.
- This region sees the GIO fulfilling the following responsibilities:
    - Provide leadership in the development and sharing of geospatial data
    - Provide leadership in the development and sharing of geospatial web services and tool
    - Provide leadership in the establishment of GIS technology and data standards
    - Promote best practices for methods and procedures related to the use and development of geospatial data and geographic information systems
    - Coordinate appropriate use of GIS through outreach and networking of potential and expert users
    - Facilitate training for skills related to use and development of geospatial information and geographic information systems
    - Coordinate and administer grants related to geospatial information and geographic information systems
    - Act as Chief Marketing Director, GIO must know client business

- This region believes the GIO should be placed in the new office of the State's Chief Information Officer.

B. Central Coast Joint Data Committee (Workshop Representation)

1) Regional Organizational Capacity
- Technology is meeting business needs in there areas of networking, data exchange, data storage, software or hardware capabilities.

Michael Baker Jr., Inc

Baker

- Funding is considered minimal. Support from ABAG, AMBA, SaCOG and occasional FGDC grants are the only listed funding mechanism.
- There is less than 5 staff available to support GIS efforts. There are adequate on-site paid employees, minimal retained consultants, and minimal volunteers.
- Strong executive support is often available.
- There is a formal process for project oversight.
- There is a need to implement policies that would facilitate data sharing.

2) California Spatial Data Infrastructure
- The following datasets are available for this region:
    - Orthoimagery (no standards, >1 m horizontal accuracy, >1 yr old, from 2003 ortho imagery created by Sanborn)
- The top 5 regional datasets this region would like to develop next are:
    - Cadastral
    - Ortho Imagery
    - Transportation
    - Elevation
    - Street Addressing

3) Regional Implementation
- This region has used the Imagery for the Nation, and the California Environmental Information Catalog, but not the 50 States Initiative, or the California Spatial Library.
- The establishment of a GIO is viewed as important.
- This region sees the GIO fulfilling the following responsibilities:
    - Provide leadership in the development and sharing of geospatial data
    - Provide leadership in the development and sharing of geospatial web services and tool
    - Promote best practices for methods and procedures related to the use and development of geospatial data and geographic information systems
    - Coordinate appropriate use of GIS through outreach and networking of potential and expert users
    - Facilitate training for skills related to use and development of geospatial information and geographic information systems
    - Coordinate and administer grants related to geospatial information and geographic information systems
    - Coordinate, streamline, standardize GIS in state agencies.

- This region believes the GIO should be placed in the new office of the State's Chief Information Officer.

II. REGIONAL WORKSHOP 2 SUMMARY

ATTENDENCE

Workshop 6 had representation from the Bay Area Regional GIS Council and the Central Coast Joint Data Committee. In all, 12 individuals and two Collaboratives were present for the workshop. Five individuals were from local government, 2 from state government, and 6 from private entities.

Michael Baker Jr., Inc

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 6
Hayward, CA

CURRENT SITUATION

1) SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Communication/Coordination • The public has some recognition of the value of mapping (in large part because of Google Maps etc.) • Given the challenging geography, it is a strength that the CA geospatial community has figured out how to organize themselves in some way. • A trifold has been developed for NSGIC that outlines achievements and current projects. • A central repository, CASIL, has been developed that makes data accessible.	• There is no state level coordinating authority. • No state data model • There is no clear communication regarding what the state wants from local governments. • Absence of ABAG representation at workshop.	• There needs to be a website to publicize geospatial information related to both CA and the region. • Identify the talking points related to business. GIS is the engine. • The Coastal Commission and the EPA had GIS Yellowpages. This is a list of people and contact information for who were working in CA in GIS. It would be great to have a map on a website where you could select an area and drill down to contacts, entities, and projects (hard to maintain).	• There is a new crop of web-based map display applications that set unrealistic expectations on the effort to develop and sustain data.
Data Sharing • There are a lot of different models of data sharing. • Caltrans has an internal geodetic dataset that people should be aware of.	• There are a broad array of agreements with a variety of legal terms of use. • No single authority responsible for the maintenance of data. • Currently no identified process or target location for the data. • Hesitation to share data given how data will be used and the data adequacy.	• There needs to be a central library of available datasets. It's hard for people to find datasets in their most current form. The Census Bureau data set lists and downloads is a good example. • There have been efforts to develop Coastal GIS for a long time. Experiences with the local governments have been diverse. Agreements to get the data have ranged from informal to paying nominal fees, to too expensive. There have been some issues with	• Any time you create a common data set that is shared through a public portal such as Google, there is a possibility that people will degrade the accuracy. There need to be rules of how this resource is maintained and who contributes. • Often times licensing agreements have been written in a way that targeted private entities. There are a lot of legal issues with informal data

Michael Baker Jr., Inc

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
		licensing agreements. • Share Caltrans internal geodetic control.	sharing. People don't always realize they need to go back to the data owner. • Things that aren't physical features are not good candidates for a common GIS data set. • Privacy concerns related to data sets.
Funding • NA	• It is hard to ask for regional funding if you haven't demonstrated why it's worthwhile. • Perception that GIS is expensive. Counter this with the reality that it is likely just 1/10th of any given improvement project.	• There is an opportunity to promote awareness for GIS. Currently, funders see it as something extra. There is a need to show business value, not just "flashy fly-throughs." You need to present more than the nice color. You need to present it in the right way so people know it's important. • GIS is used to help make better business decisions, not just pretty maps. • Homeland Security funding for orthos and cadastral data.	• There's no funding for regional efforts. This all falls on the local governments. Everybody needs the data but nobody can pay. • Large demand from the commercial sector for data and they are trying to externalize costs. • Communities are expected to spend time giving away data and teach others about it. • Funding is going to require a lobbying effort at a state level. There's a perception that lobbying is not a good activity for government employees.
Data Development • The skill sets in GIS have quadrupled in recent years. • Most counties have GIS and GIS applications or services on their websites.	• There is a need to identify authorative source and steward of each data set.	• Work towards the National Map; step out of county-only perspective. • Data sets should be "open source". • Formalize who stewards which data sets.	• There is no state standard to build upon.

Baker

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 6
Hayward, CA

REQUIREMENTS

1) Regional Discussion of Data Sharing and Standards

Attendees noted that it is wrong to ask people to convert to a standard that is not appropriate to them. A better question is can the data be converted to a common statewide standard. Statewide metadata standards don't always address the needs at a local level so this has to be addressed as well. If the standards are not in conflict, then it is possible to roll them up. You really need a base level set of standards.

The question was asked by attendees, what do we mean by standards? It is better to use the term "data model." A standard does open a lot of other questions. This is an issue of semantics. There is a balance when you're talking about content standards.

The question was asked, are there processes or programs that you have to support that require aggregated data? Answers included:

- Coastal Trail datasets.
- Emergency services- flood and earthquake data.
- Regional land use planning, smart growth.
- National Hydrography Dataset
- Census (especially if there are undercount problems)
- Addressing
- Wetlands
- Water utilities surface areas (on the wish list).
- The Emergency Shelter Database Initiative.
- Rally around the National Map as an objective.

2) Regional Discussion of Federated Data Efforts and Incentives for Participation

The interface setup for discovering and obtaining Census data is a good model. The question is what happens on the back end.

For the information services people, pushing something out is more palatable than having someone read in because of security issues. Also, if you can push data up to the state, there might be more funding available.

Alternatively, getting data from the source could ensure the data is the "latest and greatest." There does need to be incentive to get local government to do this. The compromise might be aggregating data at the regional level.

Attendees expressed concern on the feasibility of aggregating data to a statewide view. Who is going to make the data look alike and how is it going to be manipulated. NCOne Map was discussed as a good example of a statewide data view. They have seamless access to local resources and the data is stitched together at the borders to make it look like a cohesive whole. An even bigger problem is the policy or mandate to create a statewide view.

The discussion issues were generally centered around policy, resources, and funds.

IMPLEMENTATION

Michael Baker Jr., Inc

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 6
Hayward, CA

1) State Support

- The State should provide money to support regional datasharing.

- The State should adopt a data model and provide guidance/leadership and technical direction to help create/sustain regional data.

- There should be a government authorized (legislated) council that has authority in the field with state agencies.

- It's important to note that there's a fine line between providing guidance and telling others how to conduct their business. A state sanctioned data model might do more harm than good if it's not managed correctly.

- The State should ensure that progress is made on geospatial initiatives. They should promote and facilitate collaboration.

- If there are State requirements, they need to specify and publicize them. Communities might match these requirements if they are given incentives.

- The state should act more like a traditional customer would when they need data.

- Evaluate land record transaction fees as applied in Oregon.

- It's important that the State keep funding going for the California national diversity database.

2) Governance

Without a GIO as a coordinating entity the responsibility falls to the regions. But regions do what they feel is best for the regions, not the state. The regions do not have a unified approach and sometimes do not have common priorities.

The state could create several grants that provide incentives for regions to take initiative.

Commentary around the CA GIS Council:

- CA GIS Council could provide forum to communicate (maybe wiki style).

- The Council should reach out to the development community and facilitate an interest in creating functional GIS data.

- The Council should have a mandate that's recognized in the state and gives them authority.

- Short of formal authority, the Council should have more involvement from decisionmakers in departments and agencies

- There is sometimes confusion around what the Council is coordinating. This needs to be addressed.

- The Council should continue the strategic planning process. How are the state agencies going to be involved?

- There needs to be more awareness about what the Council is doing and what it advocates. They should come up with a set of goals for what they're promoting.

- Instead of being datacentric, the Council needs to focus on what's in the public interest so there's a clear case for the benefits of GIS.

Michael Baker Jr., Inc

Baker

- They should make it clear what their goals are and how people can help. What can people do to contribute?

- There's an opportunity for them to define what the desired future state of GIS is for the State of California.

Who would benefit from statewide data?

- There are small government entities that don't have funding for GIS staff. They would benefit from having access to any statewide data.

- Entities involved in regulatory programs would benefit from improved consistency of datasets.

- Local and regional stakeholders that aren't GIS enabled or experts. They would benefit from a simple mapping tool that supports advocacy and business decisions.

- Emergency services need to see what the data and resources are across the borders of cities, counties, and regions

- Computed Aided Dispatch needs to understand administrative boundaries so they can get information to the right response team.