



California GIS Council

REGIONAL GIS COUNCILS (RGCs) MEETING CONFERENCE CALL

Tuesday, January 27, 2004, 9:30 am – 11:30 am

Preliminary Conference Call Hosts: Kern COG-Bakersfield, MTC/BARGC-Oakland, Mendocino COG-Ukiah, SCAG-Los Angeles-SCAG, Southeastern California RGC-Riverside, Butte COG-Chico, SaCOG-Sacramento, Stanislaus RGC-Modesto, , San Diego RCG-San Diego, , Central Coast Joint Data Committee -Monterey

AGENDA

1) Sites dial-in, introduce attendees and review Rules of Order

The sites listed above were on the telephone bridge for the meeting.

2) Report from the Open Data Consortium- Bruce Joffe will update us on Phase II to implement the attached project recommendations. – Bruce Joffe

Bruce Joffe gave a summary of his work developing the Open Data Consortium Model Policy for Public Data Dissemination. Phase II of the project will promote this policy for adoption by local governments.

<http://www.opendataconsortium.org/>

Discussion: Bob Amos (City of Bakersfield) – asked if the policy addressed any digital submission standards for subdivisions. Bruce responded it did not. Leif Farr (Mendocino County) – Raised concerns about how the policy might affect the way his County funds GIS. Bruce offered to work with Leif on interpreting the policy for his particular case. Craig Gooch (Southeast California Regional GIS Council) – found the range of topics in the report very helpful. Rich Mader (SCAG) asked for an executive summary to help sell the concept to local officials.

Action: Bruce asked that Joe Concannon take the Model Policy to the California Geographic Information Association (CGIA) Board for endorsement. Joe committed to do this at the next meeting.

3) Report from Status of Transportation Information System Clearinghouse Project

Joe Concannon reported that the group had met since the last Regional Councils Meeting. He explained that the project committee was advising Caltrans in the development of a survey to inventory Public Street and Road GIS layers. Joe explained that the group was looking to front load the survey with information gathered through the Federal TIGER Modernization Program and Homeland Security Data Collection efforts.

Discussion: Ray McDowell said that they were still trying to get full access to the TIGER Databases. Joe added that there is no schedule yet for the survey release.

4) Report from SCAG Metadata Barriers Working Group

Rich Mader reported that he has discussed metadata barriers with his member agencies. While they have not developed a formal list of barriers, he feels that incentives may be a better way to look at the issue. Rich suggested that State developed curricula could help the regions promote metadata.

Discussion: Rob Ball (KernCOG) added that an incentive for him might be a distribution server for information included in the Environmental Information Catalog. He saw a substantial increase in requests for the information layers where he published metadata in the catalog.

5) Report from Imagery Coordination Group

Mary Tsui (Central Coast Joint Data Committee CCJDC) reported that the imagery committee has completed one report. The report looks at opportunities for partnerships and some of the reasons agencies end up acquiring less than desirable products. Mary said that they would have policies for the Council to endorse at the next meeting. The group is still grappling with metadata issues and this has led to a lack of a comprehensive view of where imagery exists.

Discussion: They group was pleased with the progress of the committee. They saw this as an opportunity develop a consumers union for aerial photography purchases.

6) Report from the Institutional Barriers Subgroup

Molly Penberth (Dept. of Conservation) updated the group on her work to document some of the State Institutional barriers to imagery coordination. The contract approval process is often the biggest barrier. It can even be hard to find out who administers the contract for a given project. Molly added that changes over the last month have made interagency agreements even harder to develop. She will have these points outlined in a draft statement in February.

7) Discussion of CGIA/Regional Councils Agenda for the February 20 1:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. Meeting

The group agreed to have a report from each of these projects. They asked for a very brief status report from each region in the introductions and for an update of the status of the State GIS councils at the meeting. The group also requested an update on the USGS National Map and Homeland Security Data collection efforts.

8) Discussion of Resources Agency Status

John Ellison from the Resources Agency gave a status report on the current budget situation. The CERES efforts will continue, although all staff has active layoff notices. There is a new contract with University of California Berkeley to add some spatial tools to parts of the Catalog for Proposition 40 and 50 work. The general fund money has been lost and the Legacy Project is looking for a new home. John said that they were still trying to develop a California GIS Council Meeting in the next month or two.

9) Schedule next update in advance of a California GIS Council Meeting

It was agreed that there will be no meetings in advance of the February 20, CALGIS Meeting.

10) Adjourn