

Bay Area Regional GIS Council Meeting Minutes
June 20, 2002

Berkeley Public Library - Public Meeting Room
1:30-3:30 pm

Attendees

- Dean Angelides, Vestra
- Eric Bayer, Farallon
- Phil Beilin, City of San Ramon
- Pat De Temple, City of Berkeley
- Phillip Dibner, Ecosystem Associates
- Harold Feinberg, CA Dept. of Conservation
- Johanna Fenton, Office of Emergency Services
- Bruce Joffe, GIS Consultants
- Jeff Kapellas, SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Notetaker)
- David Keck, BaseMaps International
- Lis Klute, Contra Costa County (Chair)
- Pat Kowta, Napa County
- Adam Lodge, San Mateo County
- Kevin Miller, Office of Emergency Services
- Brian Quinn, City of Berkeley
- Eric Seamon, City of San Francisco
- Tony Seebach, City of San Jose
- Mike Skowronek, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Kearey Smith, Association of Bay Area Governments
- Priya Tallam, Santa Clara County
- Gene Warner, Intergraph
- Fred Wong, Union Sanitation District
- Steve Wood, City of Pleasanton
- Andrew Yan, 3D Visions

1. Introduction (L. Klute, lead)

The meeting convened at 1:35 pm. After introductions, Lis reminded attendees that the goal of the meeting was to officially form the BAR-GC. The next meeting, scheduled for August 15, will cover potential projects for the BAR-GC.

2. BAR-GC formation document (L. Klute, lead)

Lis guided the group through the revised BAR-GC formation document. All comments from the April meeting were incorporated in the document. A discussion of the allocation of seats on the committee was deferred until the item on BAR-GC governance (item 5, below). It was agreed that the document needed a clear definition of "GIS." References to "OES Region 9" were changed to "OES Coastal Region". The group expressed consensus on the formation plan as revised. The group considered the need to specify an annual report to the California GIS Council in the formation document, but opted not to do so at this time.

3. Risk plan (P. Beilin, lead)

Phil presented a draft of the BAR-GC Risk Plan. The purpose of the risk plan is to present a list of issues and problems for the Council that may arise during the evaluation of potential projects. There was a brief discussion concerning the short-term goals of the Council and whether it should focus its energies on the development of standards or instead on a limited number of high-profile projects. Some attendees expressed concern that a focus on standards might bog the group down without necessarily producing anything. CGIA has made "standards" a priority, and has

formulated a number of models/examples: how to do an orthophoto MOU, what is a model data sharing arrangement, etc.

4. California GIS Council report (L. Klute, lead)

The California GIS Council (GIS COUNCIL) has developed a set of provisional guidelines and application for the formation of regional councils. [*Note: The guidelines have been posted at <http://gis.ca.gov/council/regional.epl>*] Regional councils will need to host their own websites; BAAMA has agreed to do this for the BAR-GC. Regional councils will send a representative to the GIS COUNCIL Regional Council Committee meetings. Since the CA Dept. of Information Technology will not be able to host of the GIS COUNCIL meeting [*Note: DOIT disbanded as of July 1, 2002*], the Council agreed to require federal and state members to pay \$4K annually while local counties/agencies will provide in-kind support (i.e., facilities for quarterly meetings). OES will provide \$10K to keep the Council operating until it can secure funding.

The GIS COUNCIL Subcommittee on Homeland Security reported on new federal requirements for the inventory of all public facilities, their risk of damage and the current mitigations of that risk. The State adopted a “military” data sharing model and a standard for “framework data layers” for critical “homeland security/disaster management” information. USGS wants to work with BAR-GC and Kern Regional Council to help create such framework data layers. The GIS COUNCIL meeting also featured a presentation on the Tahoe basin pilot of the National Map Project, tying together federal, state, and local info. Not surprisingly, the pilot project showed that that integration and maintenance of data from many different sources is a lot of work. Vicki Lucas, USGS coordinator of the National Map Project, would like to make a presentation to the BAR-GC to discuss how Regional Councils can help with the National Map effort.

The GIS COUNCIL met only about 20% of goals for the last year. The only steering committee formed to date was the regional council formation committee. This year, the GIS COUNCIL will focus on the formation of the industry advisory committee. It will also try to establish standards for framework data layers and develop guidelines for cost sharing of framework data development.

Bruce Joffe raised concern about having the State mandate regional data standards and that such efforts would likely not get buy-in from local efforts; regional standards will likely develop more organically through joint projects promoted/facilitated from the regions. There’s also the problem that resources should be coming from the state to support the regions, not vice-versa. Lis clarified that only state and federal members sitting on the GIS COUNCIL must pay \$4K; local/regional groups only need to host a meeting. In the meantime, support from the state will more likely come from cooperative efforts and in-kind support (development of tools, etc.), rather than actual funds.

4. BAR-GC Governance (P. De Temple, lead)

The BAR-GC Structure Subcommittee formed at the last BAR-GC meeting never met. The committee discussed a proposal by Pat for the allocation of seats on the BAR-GC: 14 allocated seats (one each for the nine Bay Area counties; the cities of Oakland and San Jose; ABAG; MTC and BAAMA) plus 11 at-large seats from the public sector agencies. In addition, the BAR-GC would have an advisory council comprised of interested parties. Each member was allowed to comment on the proposal. The comments are summarized below:

Kearey Smith (ABAG): need to look at which agencies have an interest in regional datasets (RWQCB, OES, CalTrans, BCDC) and allocate seats for them. In addition, the at-large seats should be divided among different sectors, as in the first draft of the BAR-GC Formation Document.

Pat De Temple (Berkeley): the Council will need to have rotation to ensure that the representatives bring energy, drive and resources to the table.

Eric Seamon (San Francisco): Which agency would charter the formation of the BAR-GC? Lis answered that the State originally wanted an organization to be the designated head of the council, but that proposal was rejected. Pat De Temple added the lack of a chartering organization is the reason why those who will sit on the council need official authorization from their agencies. Eric continued that the advisory board should be non-voting and should be divided by sector.

Bruce Joffe (GIS Consultants): The Council should open the at-large seats to private sector and non-profit organizations in order to tap their energy and resources.

Brian Quinn (Berkeley): The difference in privileges between council and advisory council members should be clarified.

Phillip Dibner (Ecosystem Assoc.): Support specifying at-large seats by functional areas.

Adam Lodge (San Mateo Co.): Concur with Brian Quinn.

Tony Seebach (San Jose): Some of the medium sized cities at last meeting wanted more representation, but this proposal is based on “representation by participation.”

Eric Bayer (Farallon): Agreed with Bruce J. about opening to the private sector. Also preferred dividing at-large representation into functional sectors.

Pat Kowta (Napa Co.): Felt 25 members is too large for the council and supported representation by participation to ensure active members.

Fred Wong (Union Sanitary Dist.): Would like more utility sector representation, Utilities are much like a city in size and create many of the necessary base data

layers. Unless utilities see that they have some buy-in, they will likely not participate in the council.

Priya Tallam (Santa Clara Co.): Supports the number and structure of the council, but rather than specify different cities, let city organizations decide who would represent them.

Jeff Kapellas (RWQCB): Agreed with Pat Kowta that 25 is too large. The MTC seems like a single-sector regional agency, unlike ABAG and more like OES, CalTrans and RWQCB, none of which have a designated seat on the council.

Phil Beilin (San Ramon): Support structure as proposed.

Johanna Fenton (OES): The core group of 14 should make the decision for allocation of the 11 at-large seats.

Kevin Miller (OES): Agree with the allocation of the core group, but should shrink the number of at-large seats.

Mike Skowronek (MTC): Council members should have a dedicated sector that they liaison with.

Dean Angelides (Vestra): One possibility would “generalize” the ABAG/MTC seats to one federal, one state, and two regional seats and then the at-large seats be allocated by sector.

Mike Wood (Pleasanton): Support diversity in the at-large seats, but would seek more participation/representation from smaller cities.

Gene Warner (Intergraph): Comfortable with proposal as long as the private sector is allowed to come to meetings and provide input.

Motion: Accept model of 14 allocated seat model. **Motion passed (1 nay)**

Motion: Should the distribution of the 11 at-large seats be determined by the 14 allocated seats. **Motion accepted (1 nay, 3 abstain)**. Note that an allocation of a specific seat for a sector does not preclude others from that sector from coming to the meetings, participating and making their concerns heard.

Motion: Should at large membership include private sector representation as voting members of the council? Lis noted that ESRI requested that there not be a voting seat for software vendors in order to prevent conflicts of interest, etc. Also, the GIS COUNCIL specifically prohibited private sector, non-profit entities from its governing board. Kearey Smith noted that the BAR-GC should follow state example, but emphasize that their input is still welcomed. Pat De Temple noted that the need for official authorization was put in place so that public agency representatives can

make commitments to the council, and allowing private sector representation may provide conflict of interest problems. Bruce Joffe noted that the motivation of private sector people on this council is to help on regional issues, but the lack of a vote is a disincentive to participate. The at-large representation should be “11 members of the professional community” rather than “11 members of the public sector.” Andrew Yang: The private sector could set up a subcommittee that sends a voting representative to the committee. Kearey: Don’t see how a private sector vote will make a real difference. If a private sector entity comes up with a good idea and presents it to the council, the council will support it. If the idea is bad, it won’t. Eric Bayer: Possibly ESRI can draw up a plan for a private sector advisory board. Motion: Should at large membership include private sector representation as voting members of the council? **Passed by consensus. (3 nays, 1 abstain)**

5. Designation of BAR-GC liaison to GIS COUNCIL
deferred to next meeting

6. Vote on formation.

Motion: Accept BAR-GC charter and form BAR-GC. **Motion passed by consensus.**

7. Next meeting to be held at the Berkeley Public Library, Thursday, August 15, 2002, 10 am –12 noon.

8. The meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Minutes prepared by Jeff Kapellas, SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.