

Idaho Technology Authority (ITA)

Idaho Geospatial Council – Executive Committee

Meeting Minutes: December 10, 2015

(Approved January 21, 2016)

The December 10, 2015 meeting of the Idaho Geospatial Council – Executive Committee was held at 9:30 a.m. in Conference Room B09 (Basement), Len B. Jordan Building, 650 W. State St., Boise, Idaho.

ATTENDANCE

Members/Alternate(s) Present:

Pam Bond, Dept. of Fish & Game (Chair)
Keith Weber, ISU GIS Center (phone)
Bill Farnsworth, Office of the CIO
Brynn Lacabanne, ITD (phone)
Donna Phillips, City of Hayden (phone)
Rick Campbell, US Census Bureau (phone)
Brian Liberty, Idaho Power
Wilma Robertson, Tax Commission
Frank Roberts, Innovate! Inc. (phone)
Laurie Ames, Nez Perce Tribe (phone)
Bruce Godfrey, U of I (phone)
Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello (phone)

Members Absent:

Tom Carlson, USGS
Jerry Korol, NRCS
Stewart Ward, Dioptra Geomatics
Jared Stein, Bannock County Assessor

Others Present:

Erin Seaman, Office of the CIO
Renee Bettis, Dept. of Lands
Margie Wilkins, IDWR
Cody O’Dale, ISU GIS Center
Ryan Howerton, ISU GIS Center

WELCOME

Ms. Bond called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Welcome and introductions were made.

INTERIM APPOINTMENT TO VACATED FEDERAL SEAT

Ms. Bond announced that Wendy Hawley has vacated her federal seat on the committee. In her capacity as chair, Ms. Bond has appointed Rick Campbell of the U.S. Census Bureau to fill the seat for the remainder of the term, which ends on March 31, 2016.

MOTION: Mr. Farnsworth moved and Ms. Ames seconded a motion to ratify the appointment of Rick Campbell, U.S. Census Bureau, to fill the remainder of the term of the recently vacated Federal Agency Representative seat on the IGC-EC; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Campbell gave the committee an overview of his 30+ years of experience. He is currently managing an address listing operation for the states of Washington, Idaho and Oregon. He noted that he can advocate on the committee’s behalf, on any issues that the local, tribal and state government constituents may have, to the Census Bureau.

MINUTES

MOTION: Mr. Farnsworth moved and Mr. Hill seconded a motion to approve the September 17, 2015 minutes as presented; the motion passed unanimously.

ITA REPORT

Ms. Bond reported on the recent state IT strategic planning session, which was held on December 1, and the ITA meeting which was held on December 8.

Ms. Bond discussed the status of the goals and objectives from the prior year and reported on the outcome of this year’s strategic planning session. She encouraged the members to review the strategic plan once it is available. Objectives that will be the focus for the coming year include: cybersecurity, citizen-centric services, core infrastructure, cloud services and procurement of data center services.

Ms. Bond added that she and Mr. Farnsworth would be meeting with Greg Zickau, Chief Technology Officer for the state to discuss adding some GIS-specific objectives to the state IT strategic plan for 2016. She asked the committee for their input. Suggestions included:

- Advertising and marketing of the current available layers
- Funding for a Real Time Network (RTN) for the state of Idaho
- Ongoing imagery funding
- Goal setting for cadastral over the next year or two

ITA MEETING – Ms. Bond reported on the December 8 ITA meeting. Highlights included:

- Two policies were approved: [P1080](#) (Cloud Computing) and [P4560](#) (Data Breach Management)
- A presentation on cyber liability insurance by Faith Cox, the new statewide Risk Manager
- Greg Zickau gave an update on the telecommunications contract, which is expected to result in an overall cost-savings to the state, although some of the more remote sites may end up paying a bit more due to their location

SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE (SDI) REVIEW

Mr. Weber was joined by Cody O’Dale and Ryan Howerton, the students who undertook the strategic plan and SDI review semester project under his supervision. He thanked Mr. O’Dale and Mr. Howerton for their work on this project and discussed their three primary goals, which were:

- Identify specific sections of the 2009 Strategic Plan in need of revision
- Recommend the top five high-priority revisions
- Characterize the current geospatial community in Idaho to better understand the needs of the community.

Mr. Weber will be sending out the full report, along with the summary results from the 2015 survey and the 2008 survey. The 2015 survey was nearly identical to the original from 2008, and there were 76 respondents (the initial survey had 36). He briefly reviewed the survey results and asked the committee to take some time to review this. He believed it would be possible to identify some future goals and revisions for the strategic plan by studying and comparing the results of these two surveys.

ITA POLICIES/STANDARDS/GUIDELINES DISCUSSION

Ms. Bond explained that she hadn’t seen any movement on the Federal Geospatial Data Act, and that she would like the committee to begin reviewing a few of the standards and guidelines and at least make minor revisions such as updating broken links and changing outdated verbiage. She suggested starting with the Geospatial Metadata standard (S4220) and the Geographic Metadata guideline (G320), which are related, and should therefore make it easier. She would like to get this standard and guideline out to the committee and maybe IGC at large for review.

Discussion followed about the importance of policies and standards in how agencies conduct business. It was noted that there was a need for better education of staff within the various agencies regarding compliance. It was also suggested that given the discussion around cybersecurity, that the IGC or IGC-EC could begin to get some ideas on paper that the GIS community agrees with, which will allow the GIS community to have a meaningful conversation as things start happening on cybersecurity at the state level and to act pre-emptively.

DATA SHARING STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Farnsworth, Mr. Weber and Mr. Godfrey briefly discussed the data sharing standards. Issues that will likely affect the GIS community were discussed, including: data classification, parcel data and cybersecurity. It was also suggested that it would make sense to look at the International Standards, especially as cybersecurity links to the metadata and infrastructure.

ITA STANDARD

ENTERPRISE STANDARD S4250 (ENTERPRISE GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM [GIS] INTERAGENCY DATA SHARING STANDARDS – Mr. Farnsworth gave an overview of draft ITA Standard S4250. Feedback has been consolidated into the draft, but expanded definitions have not yet been added. He requested assistance from the committee on the expanded definitions. He clarified that the standard will apply to interagency data sharing and the executive branch, and puts practices already widely in use into a standard. It will also let public and federal partners know what formats agencies will have data available in, but will not restrict additional formats.

Ms. Robertson expressed concern that this standard implied that the data created and aggregated by the state of Idaho and its employees is public. She emphasized that it is not all public and asked if it would apply to all data, rather than just GIS data, and whether there was already a policy in place covering that.

Mr. Farnsworth responded that he didn't believe there was already a policy in place relating to that. That was typically left up to agencies. He commented that there was probably more sharing on an inter-agency basis than almost any other field, and that other sharing of records was very specific. He noted that GIS is traditionally shared a lot, but that statutory and regulatory requirements would be exempt from this standard.

Mr. Farnsworth noted that the feedback he had received thus far had not included any directional changes. It was agreed that Mr. Farnsworth would send this out to the group for additional feedback.

TWG UPDATES

GEODETIC CONTROL – Mr. Weber reported that this group had been meeting monthly, but is now meeting bi-monthly. Their next meeting will be in January. He briefly discussed the following:

- Multi-state Control Point Database (MCPD) – There are almost 9,000 control points in the database. More information can be found at: <http://ags.giscenter.isu.edu/flexviewers/mcpd/>, and a mobile-enabled website has been recently stood up at: <http://bit.ly/mcpdlite>
- The Real Time Networks (RTN) in eastern and southeastern Idaho – More information can be found at: <http://giscenter.isu.edu/research/Techpg/GC/rtn.htm>
- The Control Point standard is being drafted by Mr. Weber and Dr. Arifuzzaman and is anticipated to go to the TWG for review in January, and eventually will come to IGC-EC.

CADASTRAL REFERENCE – Ms. Bettis reported that the CADNSDI version 2.0 is now in the parcel fabric using the local government model. Many areas have been adjusted. She briefly reviewed the survey grade points being collected from various sources, noting that IDL started with state ownership and will in the future expand to private ownership parcels to get the entire state into the parcel fabric. She reviewed an example of a current and newly adjusted section. The TWG planned to begin meeting on a bi-monthly basis beginning in January.

Ms. Bettis noted that CADNSDI 2.0 had thousands of errors and IDL has been working with the BLM to determine where to make adjustments. She noted that once they are on the same page as Utah, IDL will move to it, but currently they are maintaining their land records at IDL and in the parcel fabric.

IMAGERY – Ms. Wilkins reported that the Imagery TWG met the previous week and plans to meet more frequently going forward. She discussed the 2015 Idaho NAIP, which is expected to be published by the end of January. There is some interest in “buying up” to half meter on the next cycle of NAIP, but there remains work to be done in order to decide what kind of interest there is in it, and how to fund it. More information can be found on the Imagery TWG website at: <http://gis.idaho.gov/portal/TIM/imagery.html>
Ms. Wilkins stated that the TWG may send out another survey to gauge interest in funding possibilities.

Discussion followed, and it was noted that Google aerial imagery and other options were being investigated. Ms. Wilkins noted that in looking at other options there needed to be an apples-to-apples comparison of services and products. Several comments were made that questions still needed to be answered regarding the licensing side of Google and what the restrictions would be. Mr. Farnsworth agreed to confirm with the Department of Administration's fiscal division whether there would be any problem with invoicing agencies, counties, cities or private groups, so long as fiscal boundaries are not crossed.

OTHER BUSINESS

RE-CAP OF THE FALL 2015 IGC BI-ANNUAL MEETING – Ms. Bond stated that although it was a great idea to include informal updates from the GIS community, being limited to one-hour did not give them enough time to get through the entire agenda. She would like to see these informal updates (“campfire talks”) continue and become a regular agenda item for the bi-annual meetings.

IGC EXPENSE ACCOUNT – Ms. Bond explained that since the fall bi-annual meeting had been scheduled during a lunch hour, there had been discussion about the feasibility of providing lunches to the attendees, which brought up the idea of creating an expense account for that purpose. The State Board of Examiners State Travel Policy and Procedures requires that certain criteria be met in order to qualify a meeting for refreshment or meal costs. The fall bi-annual meeting did not meet the criteria.

Ms. Phillips commented on the logistics and difficulties involved in planning out of town meetings. She raised the point that Northern Rockies URISA has been sponsoring various parts of the IGC bi-annual meetings since the beginning, but she emphasized that these activities cost money, and it was not always possible to get those expenses covered by others. She asked the committee to think about a funding mechanism to cover the costs for those times.

Mr. Farnsworth noted that OCIO can to some degree cover the cost of meeting space, and does pay for the meeting rooms for IGC-EC meetings. The limitation is on paying for meals, which cannot be done unless a meeting meets the state policy requirements. He expressed appreciation for those groups who have provided meeting spaces and covered costs, adding that URISA has done that a number of times.

Ms. Bond asked the group to keep in mind that when meetings are held in various locations around the state, at some level, the IGC relies on local staff to help with the logistics for a meeting. No decision was made with regard to an IGC expense account.

PLANNING FOR THE SPRING 2016 IGC BI-ANNUAL MEETING – Ms. Bond asked people to start thinking about possible topics for the spring meeting.

ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 11:34 a.m. The next meeting was scheduled for January 21, 2016 in room B09 (Basement), Len B. Jordan Building, 650 W. State St., Boise, Idaho.

Respectfully submitted,



Erin Seaman, Office of the CIO