

CALIFORNIA GIS STRATEGIC PLAN PHASE 2: REGIONAL PARTICIPATION

**Regional Workshop #4:
Ventura, CA
October 25, 2007**

Prepared for:

**California GIS Council &
California Geographic Information Association**

Prepared by:

Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Baker

Prepared on: **October 29, 2007**

I. PREWORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS

A. Channel Islands Regional GIS Collaborative

1) Regional Organizational Capacity

- Technology is not meeting business needs in the areas of networking or data exchange capabilities, but is suitable for data storage, hardware, and software capabilities.
- Funding is ranked 3 on a 1 to 4 (minimal) scale. CIRGIS is a 501©4 and receives CAP grants and income from teaching ArcGIS classes.
- There are no staff available to support GIS efforts. There are minimal retained consultants and adequate volunteers.
- Strong executive support is seldom available.
- There is no formal process for project oversight.

2) California Spatial Data Infrastructure

- The following datasets are available for this region:
 - Cadastral (no standards, 0.5-1.0 m horizontal accuracy, >1 yr old, from member cities and data requests from counties)
 - Ortho Imagery (no standards, >1 m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from AirphotUSA.)
 - Transportation (no standards, >1.0m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from member cities and counties)
 - Governmental Units (no standards, >1 m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from various city and county members)
 - Street Addressing (no standards, >1 m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from address point data from selected cities)
 - Buildings and Facilities (no standards, >1m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from two member cities only)
- The top 5 regional datasets this region would like to develop next are:
 - Elevation
 - Hydrography
 - Flood Hazards
 - Cultural and Demographic Statistics
 - Earth Cover

3) Regional Implementation

- This region has used the California Spatial Library, and the California Environmental Information Catalog, but not the 50 States Initiative, or the Imagery for the Nation.
- 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
- This region believes the GIO should be placed in a state program agency (e.g., Resources, Health and Human Services, Environmental Protection, Business, Transportation and Housing, etc.)

II.REGIONAL WORKSHOP 1 SUMMARY

ATTENDENCE

Workshop 4 had representation from the Channel Islands Regional GIS Collaborative. In all, 10 individuals and one Collaborative were present for the discussion. 3 individuals were from local government, 2 from state government, 1 from federal government, and 5 from private entities.

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 4

Ventura, CA

CURRENT SITUATION

1) SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<p>Communication/Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIRGIS has had successful collaborations in the last few years. 3 ortho programs and a sustainable model. • There has been a lot of engagement by the GIS community. • Both Ventira and Santa Barbara counties now have GIOs. • Ventura interacts with other public agencies. Its not always GIS related but there are good established relationships and data agreements. Often biological projects cross borders so its beneficial to share data. • Both counties confirmed that they have a well developed source of GIS staff throughout the county government in a range of departments. It's important to have a good "critical mass." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relying on future grants for technology enhancements and data refreshes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is plenty of opportunity to grow. • There is a new program in Santa Barbara starting with people, hardware, and software. There is a lot of opportunity for collaboration with the Regional Collaborative. • Goal is to have all of the cities become members of CIRGIS. • There is a UCSB campus GIS program that is highly regarded but does not have much interaction outside of the school. • There is an opportunity to collaborate with LA County LARAIT Collaborative to collect orthoimagery and Pictometry for the county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Thousand Oaks on the border with LA County does not currently collaborate at all with LA.
<p>Data Sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have a data server for the regional collaborative that was heavily used during the fires (actually overloaded). • Data sharing on biological, streets, and boundaries (agency to agency interactions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cal State Channel Islands is building a GIS lab. This, along with student assistance work could be a resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Funding</p>			

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 4

Ventura, CA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have established a 501c4CERGIS obtained 3 CAP Grants relation to 1) Organizational, 2) Metadata, and 3) National Map: Model Sustained Funding • Ventura has politicians that are generally well informed about GIS and its value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is still a weakness, even in Ventura. “Selling the idea” is not a direct link to the money. There is one bucket that must fund everyone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is always the opportunity to get more grants. • Ventura’s goal is to be financially self sufficient. They act and operate like a business, and look for opportunities for revenue generation and sharing of costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost sharing • Revenue generation
<p>Data Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIRGIS doesn’t yet have a plan for the next six months. They have been opportunistic in the past, and don’t know what opportunities will arise in the future. They work in a cycle-data development, planning (determining what’s important next). They are now in the planning stage. • CIRGIS lacks hard formed processes. The county has processes which they can learn from. • Have a hybrid centerline with address points • Ventura County has street centerlines but no home-type centerline details • Ventura County needs ground control; even more important than a Master Address Database. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be someone to work with the board and build confidence. • The counties would like a master address database. There is currently not one database that has all valid addresses in a jurisdiction. Ventura is in the process of compiling the pieces to begin updating this database. • CIRGIS wants to come up with a minimalist data model for street addressing that will be regionally applicable. An ad hoc group met and is working on such a data model. • Good DEM data is a high priority. 	

REQUIREMENTS

1) Regional Discussion of Data Sharing and Standards

CIRGIS would love for there to be data standards. This would be beneficial to make data interoperable both across and within regions. They have already gone to some effort to develop their own model (and have their own Region interoperable standard), however are open to suggestions.

It is difficult for local agencies to use state/regional data because it is not always to the local level of detail. Attendees noted that the State would be the newcomer and could work towards all Regionals being compatible with a minimum common standard.

Ventura has mature GIS data with hundreds of applications looking at the data including social services, health, and justice. Yes they are interested in standards that allow them to be interoperable. They would adopt those standards where the minimum is not below their minimum standard. They do not want a standard that would negatively impact the entire environment.

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

- Ventura County has many programs with both state and federal government where data is shared back and forth with varying levels of aggregation. These programs are related to the justice systems, health, social services, etc.
- It was noted that the state is a newcomer in this process and must approach this as a collaboration to help define the standards. The effort should start at the local level with the state ultimately adopting their standards.
- The City of Oxnard noted that when they developed their data, there were not clear cut standards and if there had been, it would've been easy to adopt. Even now it would be relatively easy to adopt a standard, but this must be voluntary or with a focus at the local level.

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

Ventura County believes the federated data model is the only model that will work. Having many different central warehouses will cause confusion. Now is the time to implement the federated data model. They are now building data, so this is the best time to set standards. Now is the time when they'll get the best bang for their buck, so they are 100% behind it.

The last CIRGIS cap grant was to help build these kinds of services. They used federal standards and built services that are registered in Geospatial One Stop. They hit multiple data sources across the internet which feed into this service. Using a web service gives you a level of independence from the data format.

There was concern expressed over who would do the quality control checks for data in a federated data model. There was some encouragement for having data hosted in a central place.

It has been recognized at the state level, in Sacramento, that the regions can provide “bottom-up” data.

California needs bigger CAP grants. Our State size necessitates more money than is allocated in a CAP grant.

IMPLEMENTATION

1) State Support

It was noted that there are localities that dislike “statewide values” and would resist even help from the state.

The question was asked, what can the state do for you? Answers included:

- It would be nice to have a set of standards or goals regarding what data layers you should have etc. What should the city, county, and state do together? If the state filled that gap, it would be useful.
- The state should serve as a lead on legal interpretation and provide guidance on legal issues or proprietary values. The CA Attorney General opinion should be a positive impact. More data sets available and reaching 100% county compliance.
- The state should run quality control checks when people are submitting data and metadata to ensure that all of the elements are there and the data remains stable. They should encourage departments to have a specific email address for this designated purpose, not an individual’s address which becomes inactive when that person leaves.
- The question was asked, who’s going to pay for this. The local reaction will perceive this as an unfunded mandate.
- Discussion on establishing a common email address such as parcel@countyname and parcel@cityname so when data is needed it is staff independent and will be received.

2) Governance

In the absence of a GIO, the GIS Council can:

Communicate information about recognized best practices. They can help spread the word about what other regions are up to.

Ventura County commented that they are self contained. They have the data they need because they have created it. They envision the state GIO doing what the state needs to do their business. The state needs to do a better job at planning on any level. If the state

needs regional data, they need to determine how best local and county government can feed the data to them. They see the vision for the state GIO as for the state's benefit. The state GIO is there to help the state work with other states and the federal government. If the state GIO doesn't determine what they need, the regions can't help them.

While you can temporarily work without a GIO, ultimately you will need one. Without a GIO you will miss other opportunities. It will take time to convince people of the need. Otherwise we'll keep having these workshops. There's a paper from 15 years ago that is remarkably similar to what's being done now. The benefit of these councils is that the GIO won't be starting from scratch. Work quickly to establish a central coordinating authority.

Commentary around the CA GIS Council:

At the regional level there is not a lot known about the GIS Council. They have little power and a huge mandate to accomplish things. This is a huge area of potential responsibility. It would help for them to focus on just a few things. Prioritization can be the most difficult task. The focus could be on homeland security because that's where the money is.

When asked if they felt like they were represented in the Council, the academics spoke up and indicated yes however there was discussion on lack of Regional or County participation.

Council should better communicate via the web or a Newsletter.