

**Minutes of the  
Arizona Geographic Information Council  
Data Committee  
October 20, 2009  
Arizona State Land Department Building**

Attendees:

Keith Larson, USDA  
Jean Ann Rodine, AZDEQ  
Victor Gass, AZDEQ  
Gene Trobia, SCO  
Jana Hutchins, ASU  
Sue Smith, ADWR  
Wes Kortuem, ADHS  
Boyd Larkin, AZDOR  
Tom Tyndall, State Parks  
Brian Sherman, GITA  
Tim Colman, SCO

Committee Members via Teleconference:

Howard Ward, Private Sector  
Scott Edward, UESAZ  
Kevin Blake, Yavapai County  
Tom Sturm, USGS  
Candace Bogart, USFS

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 am. A quorum was established.

Review of Senate Bill 1318 provisions pertaining to data sharing

Gene Trobia reported on the passing of Senate Bill 1818 and the relevance of the bill to AGIC. He referred to Title 37-178 data sharing.doc that was distributed prior to the meeting. This is an extract that Gene put together of the section of the law that came out of SB 1318 pertaining to data. Please refer to the document. The law provides flexibility to agencies with regard to data sharing, including charging commercial use fees. He advised agencies to update their data distribution policies to reflect the new law. Section C of the document goes on to hold data custodians harmless from liabilities from sharing data. Section D allows for the withholding of data that is defined as Critical Infrastructure under section 41-1801 of the law. This section establishes a board to define what types of information will be covered.

Gene Trobia discussed two recent lawsuits in California that dealt with the withholding of public information, specifically parcel data of which Santa Clara County lost, the other county chose to release their data. This type of lawsuit may start spreading nationally. The importance to Arizona is not clear as public record laws vary from state to state.

Recently Google and ESRI have been requesting Arizona statewide datasets. A decision has not been made for the sharing of these datasets, although the Clearinghouse is being designed for agency-to-agency sharing. The issue of data sharing guidelines should be taken up by a work group and report back to the committee.

### AGIC Planning Workshops: Data Issues Discussion

Gene summarized the nature and results of the four strategic planning workshops held in Flagstaff, Kingman, Peoria (Phoenix), and Tucson between Sept. 23 and Oct. 1. He shared the preliminary report on the findings from the workshop that was put together by the consulting team of Applied Geographics and Baker, "AGIC Strategic Planning: Preliminary Findings Summary". The report includes the preliminary results of the on-line survey, characteristics of workshop attendees, and results of the workshops data prioritization and Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats exercises. Other points discussed were business drivers and consolidated data prioritization for the Clearinghouse. This was followed by a brief overview of the planned activities for the workshop activities that will be held at the AGIC Conference on Thursday Nov. 5, 2009. The consultants will present the findings during the first workshop session. The remainder of the sessions will be devoted to obtaining additional input from attendees.

**Action:** Gene will determine if the consultants are OK with having the preliminary report made available in advance of the Conference.

### Commercial use charge policy and the AGIC portal and GIS Clearinghouse topics were combined into a common discussion

Discussion of these items was combined. For the short term, there will not be any changes to current portal distribution policies, but we will need to sort out how changes will be made to reflect the new flexibility provided by Title 37-178 (see 1. above). We will also need to plan how to migrate from the portal to a broader clearinghouse. There was a discussion of how much direction we can expect from the clearinghouse business plan being developed by the strategic planning consultants for this migration effort. Gene thought that the plan will be a guideline

– we will need to provide the implementation details. The 2010 FGDC Cooperative Agreement Program includes a category for business plan development that we could apply for that would allow us to obtain funding for working out a detailed plan. The group decided that this will not be pursued in 2010 due to the number of existing pressing commitments, but that going after this in 2011 could be a possibility. The discussion continued with Jana Hutchins providing a possible distributed clearinghouse model (services, metadata, and being directed to agency sites for download) that would be consistent with the flexibility now available for data sharing. Jana Hutchins and Victor Gass discussed the type of access and access levels a clearinghouse may require. Howard Ward mentioned the benefits of a clearinghouse to external users should be considered. The point was made that we should take steps to assure that data in the clearinghouse is robust and does not become stagnant. Victor Gass and others liked seeing the other successful clearinghouse examples that were presented at the strategic planning workshops. Utah was discussed as one good example of a clearinghouse that may be useful as a template for AGIC. The group agreed that the State's current business drivers (broadband, renewable energy, AZ3D) will dictate how clearinghouse development unfolds. AGIC's role in working on this was discussed next. It was decided that a work group should be created to address clearinghouse implementation issues.

**Action:** Gene agreed to send out an e-mail soliciting volunteers to participate in a working group that will address implementation issues.

#### NAIP: Discussions with contractors at the NSGIC Conference

Tom told the group that he talked to staff from Surdex and Northwest Group, the two contractors that have done most of the western states NAIP work, about their willingness to enter into side contracts for IR and high resolution ortho collection during NAIP projects. In general, both companies were interested. Northwest indicated that if significant amounts were available, they would like to know prior to bidding on 2010 NAIP projects. Tom said he would follow up with the NAIP staff at APFO to find out about the 2010 contracting schedule. Candace Bogart asked about how much certainty we would have regarding a contractor for AZ. Tom replied that nothing would be completely certain but the contractors would take the potential for partnership funding into account when making bids on projects.

**Action:** Gene will send out an e-mail asking again for possible partnering interest for IR and high resolution data.

Continued funding for the AZ Imagery Server was brought up and a discussion ensued about continued support for the server. At this point ASU no longer has funds to support the Imagery Server. Victor proposed that a request for additional funding be made by the Data Committee at the Nov. Board meeting. This will allow time to maintain the existing server environment, while a subset of the committee can meet and determine the next phase of how imagery can best be served to the AGIC community. The Committee agreed to take this request forward to the Board.

**Action:** Request funding the Arizona Imagery Server through December, 2009 at next board meeting for NAIP and the imagery server.

Gene reported that there were some Outreach activities that occurred through NSGIC and the Agriculture may be interested in fully funding NAIP every year. States should still be able to continue to purchase “buy-ups” and work directly with the vendor for additional services.

Gene indicated the IR is not too expensive and the committee could send out another round of emails to determine who may want to fund IR and more resolute imagery “buy-ups”. Purchasing “buy-ups” through the vendor may be much less expensive.

**Action:** Send out request for those who would like to purchase the IR and higher resolution imagery through the vendor.

#### USGS LiDAR acquisition through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (stimulus)

This item was tabled due to lack of time, but Gene Trobia did ask a question about timing. Tom replied that we will need to be prepared to respond to this effort, possibly in November, if we are interested in writing a proposal to obtain LiDAR funds. Tom noted that the likelihood of receiving funds would increase significantly if matching State money was available.

**Action:** Send out request for those who would be interested in obtaining LiDAR data and would have funds to contribute to the USGS stimulus LiDAR effort.

#### Next steps

Actions from the meeting were reviewed.

#### Additional Business

No additional business.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.