

CALIFORNIA GIS STRATEGIC PLAN PHASE 2: REGIONAL PARTICIPATION

**Regional Workshop #5:
Visalia, CA
November 6, 2007**

Prepared for:

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

Prepared by:

Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Baker

Prepared on: **November 8, 2007**

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

I. PREWORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS

A. San Joaquin Valley Regional GIS Council (Workshop Representation)

1) Regional Organizational Capacity

- Technology is not meeting business needs in data exchange, data storage, or hardware capabilities, but is suitable for networking, data storage, hardware and software capabilities.
- Funding is ranked 3 (on a 1 to 4 scale, with 4 minimal). There are no funding mechanisms in place to support regional GIS efforts.
- There are less than 5 staff available to support GIS efforts. There are adequate onsite paid employees and minimal retained consultants and volunteers.
- Strong executive support is occasionally available.
- There is no 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:
 - Elevation (no standards, >1 m horizontal accuracy, >1 year old, from USGS DEM)
- The top 5 regional datasets this region would like to develop next are:
 - Elevation
 - Street Addressing
 - Utilities
 - Flood Hazards
 - Biological Resources

3) Regional Implementation

- This region has used the California Spatial Library, and the California Environmental Information Catalog, but not the 50 States Initiative 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 and administer grants related to geospatial information and geographic information systems
- This region believes the GIO should be placed in a state agency that is programmatically neutral with broad, enterprise wide responsibilities – e.g., the

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

State Library, the Governors' Office of Planning and Research (OPR) or the Department of Technology Services (DTS).

II. REGIONAL WORKSHOP 2 SUMMARY

ATTENDENCE

Workshop 5 had exclusive representation from the San Joaquin Valley Regional GIS Collaborative with 10 attendees. Eight individuals were from local government and 2 individuals were from private entities.

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5
 Visalia, CA

CURRENT SITUATION

1) SWOT Analysis

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<p>Communication/Coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valleywide, there is strong collaborative effort between four or five counties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are missing Stanislaus or San Joaquin. The northern counties feel closer to Sacramento. Tulare makes effort to stay connected to Kern County but it is challenging. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They would participate in regional efforts if someone organized them, but they aren't going to organize it themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISIS Center is trending down and may impact regional efforts.
<p>Data Sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sharing strong with no formal agreements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kings and Tulare communicate but have no formal data sharing agreements. There are no funds for regional data, and in reality, counties only need the data that are close to their borders. Regional collaboration is difficult because the data attributes are not standardized and the fields don't match. It is hard to integrate the data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an opportunity to continue working together iwht data sharing if they can find a "trigger" to initiate the coordination. A trigger such as pesticides, which might have funding available, was suggested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has not been enough pre-thought on how to standardize data. There was an agreement in place between Visalia and Tulare but this was nullified by the CA Attorney General opinion.
<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tulare County is able to bill the COG for their time because they're embedded in their agency. This creates a funding mechanism. The budget has been improving for Tulare County. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is more reactive than proactive. There are no funding mechanisms to do anything regionally. It is difficult to get grants for regional data development because of the boundaries. There is no grant entity, so they can't receive and administer grants. Caltrans funds go to COGS not to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be a funding mechanism for maintaining and developing data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding that is provided by Caltrans goes to COG or CAG and does not always go those who are building/maintaining the data.

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<p>Data Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The biggest regional efforts have come from the aerial imagery program. The ISIS center provides motivation for data development (however they are now in transition) • King is taking the lead in developing GIS data countywide. They are bringing cities together to bolster countywide efforts. This gives building blocks later for regional efforts. 	<p>those who build/sustain data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No common standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caltrans UPLAN requires that data be created. Missed opportunity to build out to regional usefulness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For UPLAN, Caltrans assumed that data existed, but it wasn't always available for every county.

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

REQUIREMENTS

1) Regional Discussion of Data Sharing and Standards

San Joaquin Regional Collaborative is willing to adopt standards, depending on the difficulty. It is difficult to change what they are already doing. If the standards are significantly different from what they already have, then it's really hard.

Tulare County is striving more for consistency than accuracy of data. Absolute accuracy would be great but it's very expensive.

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

- UPLAN was the first program that came to mind. There might be others, but there is no communication about them.
- The only data they share with the state is Williamson Act data. They are required to provide lands that fall under the Williamson Act. (The Williamson Act is a tax relief measure for owners of farmland who guarantee their land will remain farmland for at least ten years.)
- The comment was made that they should also be developing a good address system for 911 Emergency Response.
- They provide data to the Census Bureau, via LUCA, with minimal data received back. This makes it problematic to contribute data. Also, the census block geometry is a challenge. The counties should be involved in developing this geometry.
- The USDA and Agricultural Agency have data requirements that are served by the region.

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

Attendees commented that the only way data can be accurate is at the local level.

Consistency is a problem from City to county, and from County to regional or state.

Sharing data isn't going to be consistent without a standardized anchoring system.

There is a need for a regional agency to hold the data. The counties don't have adequate server space for regional data sets.

Local politician's are also opposed to regional data, and there's no regional agency to work with.

There needs to be a place where you can share information. There are data sets that other counties could benefit from, but no place to share them.

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

An example of Tulare County's strength is in developing their own data, parcels, etc. If they could work with a regional agency who had resources such as web programmers and large data repositories, all would benefit.

The state could host the data and do the web programming but there'd be a lot of work involved in integrating all of the data. In the future, the regional and counties would develop their data differently.

The ISIS center could host the data, but they require a fee which no one can/could afford. It makes more sense to push data to the state unless the state is willing to fund a regional hosting model.

There is a need for sustainability. Grants are not ongoing guaranteed funding.

IMPLEMENTATION

1) State Support

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

They would need to provide funding and a directive. They need to provide direction in addition to funds.

The more important regional question is what does the state need from the regional collaboratives and how are they going to pay for it? They need to provide incentive to generate more accurate data.

There is also a concern about equity and how to compensate county's equally. If one county does not have data or GIS, are they funded to establish GIS and data? For the counties who already have GIS and data sets, how will they be compensated or are they expected to just donate their data?

The state should make their plans more clear to the regional collaboratives. How is the process sustainable and who is responsible for keeping data up-to-date? If data is updated frequently, the cost becomes expensive. The counties main responsibility is to the taxpayers in their area, not regional or state initiatives.

Emergency preparedness is one way to get money. If there was a disaster and counties had to compile data, right now they couldn't do it quickly or easily, or at all.

Attendees noted the Assessors Office collects taxes so why put effort into improving GIS?

Attendees noted that Caltrans is providing TeleAtlas streets to government agencies. This is a valuable resource and a good model.

There needs to be more of a focus on streets and point addresses as opposed to parcels. This will provide a better tie into government agencies with more money (homeland security grant funds). If the state takes a stronger role in making streets and address point

CALIFORNIA PHASE 2 STRATEGIC PLAN : REGIONAL WORKSHOP 5

Visalia, CA

the main datasets to develop, then the streets tie better to geodetic control. The development community is the biggest side pushing for parcels, but street and addressing is more related to human lives, which is where the money is.

Related to the topic above, discussion should take place and a standards developed on how to model multi-tenant units. Model as one point or actual, such as fifty points?

The state could improve its own use of the technology. There are places that should be using GIS and are not. There are also instances when the state requires data from counties and then they put it in a file cabinet and they don't look at it again.

2) Governance

Without a GIO it is a “need-driven system.” Whoever needs something and can pay for it will get it done. There was discussion around the power of “muddling” through. Regional collaboratives continue to cope with what is needed.

Commentary around the CA GIS Council:

It would help if the Council gave direction regarding the development of state standards.

Attendees asked, why does the state need parcel sets? They don't perform land use planning.

Aerials are updated frequently, parcels in their current state are imperfect but useful, so the top priority should be address data sets.