




Oregon Statewide Strategy for Geographic Information Final Report

November 30, 2010



Cy Smith, Statewide GIS Coordinator
Chair, Coalition of Geospatial Organizations (COGO)
President-elect, Urban/Regional Info Sys Assoc. (URISA)
Past President, Natl. States Geographic Info. Council
Oregon Dept. of Administrative Services/EISPD
Geospatial Enterprise Office
955 Center St. NE, Room 470
Salem, OR 97301
503-378-6066 office
<http://gis.oregon.gov>

Date: November 30, 2010

Agreement Number: G09AC00066

Project Title: Oregon Statewide Strategy for Geographic Information Management
Final report

Organization: Geospatial Information Office (GEO), 955 Center St. NE, Room 470,
Salem, OR, <http://gis.oregon.gov>

Principal Investigator: Cy Smith, (503) 378 6066, cy.smith@state.or.us

This project produced a refreshed strategic plan for geographic information management and coordination for Oregon. The previous plan was created in 2001, prior to the Fifty States Initiative. While that plan was for development of Oregon's portion of the NSDI, there are aspects of the Fifty States Initiative that can be improved in Oregon with development of a refreshed plan. We recently developed a detailed business plan, called navigatOR, that is based, in part on our understanding of the Fifty States Initiative, but no documentation of the strategy behind that business plan has been produced.

Summary of activities to date:

- Planned and conducted a series of facilitated group discussions titled "Let's Talk" focusing on open communication and frank dialog to elicit information about navigatOR, how it's working, what needs to change and where we need to go. Meeting locations: GIS in Action (Or, WA URISA), Pendleton, Ontario, Lakeview, Bend, Portland, Salem and Roseburg. Meetings occurred between April 21st and June 19th, 2009.

More information on GIS activities and coordination in Oregon is available online: <http://gis.oregon.gov>

Questions? Contact: Cy Smith (503) 378-6066, cy.smith@state.or.us

Milt Hill (503) 378-3157, milton.e.hill@state.or.us

- Meeting results were summarized and distributed back to those individuals that attended meeting to allow for edits or additional comments to be captured.
- Oregon project staff met with Gail Ewart, GIO, State of Idaho and Danielle Ayan, Georgia GIS Clearinghouse Manager, State of Georgia to discuss their respective 50 States GIS Strategic Planning efforts
- We convened a Strategic Plan Steering Committee composed of representatives from State, Regional and Local Government and the University System. This group discussed information gathered to date and provided strategic guidance. We discovered that Metro's Data Resource Center (the GIS business group in Oregon's largest regional Government) was similarly refreshing their strategic plan. We've since met again with Metro and are working to align our planning activities.
- We conducted research on existing benefit accrual tracking mechanism both within and outside the GIS community.
- We conducted a nationally attended webex/teleconference focused on benefit accrual tracking and solicited volunteers for additional working teleconferences. We've had one additional webex/teleconference with a smaller workgroup.
- We presented an interim progress report to the Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC) on September 16th, 2009. Key points shared with OGIC (summarized from all prior input) include:
 - Users value GEO-provided coordination, Framework data and Standards
 - Knowledge of GIS technology is lacking in some areas or applications
 - Lack of model agreements with collaboration or data sharing
 - Lack of communication from Western area of State to Eastern area
 - GIS governance is weighted too heavily towards State government
 - Insufficient sustainable funding/insufficient funding in general
 - Limited use of GIS in the socio-economic arena
 - Lack of metrics related to cost and benefit of GIS in Oregon
- We facilitated a group discussion with OGIC at the March 2010 Meeting in which we heard a distinct call to revisit the actions identified in our previous planning efforts. OGIC indicated that they wanted to move forward with the navigatOR strategy, rather than putting more effort in to a new Strategic Plan. The end result from this input is a Strategic Plan follows the CAP Grant template, but is also aligned with the navigatOR Implementation Plan. The navigatOR Implementation Plan will need to be refreshed so that it reflects what has been accomplished over the last couple of years since it was drafted, and it will be refreshed based on the Strategic Plan.
- This revised and final version of the plan was drafted, reviewed and edited internally and circulated to the Oregon GIS Community for review. Minor comments were received and integrated into the final document.



More information on GIS activities and coordination in Oregon is available online: <http://gis.oregon.gov>

Questions? Contact: Cy Smith (503) 378-6066, cy.smith@state.or.us

Milt Hill (503) 378-3157, milton.e.hill@state.or.us

- The final document was presented to OGIC for endorsement at the September 2010 Meeting. OGIC endorsed the plan at that time.

Next Steps:

- Based in part of feedback received from OGIC at the March 2010 meeting we will update the navigatOR Implementation Plan and that will be sent forward to this same group for endorsement in the near future.
- The two plans together form the basis for moving navigatOR forward effectively in the next legislative session and in the coming years.

Feedback on Cooperative Agreements Program

What are the CAP Program strengths and weaknesses?

The administrative overhead associated with a grant was daunting and would discourage us from applying for another without considerable forethought. We've applied for CAP funds since that time and are pleased to see that the program has been restructured to not be a grant.

Where does it make a difference?

We knew we needed to produce an updated Strategic Plan. The CAP gave us focus and a timeline that assured a product at the end. The funds were helpful too.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?

The funds were both helpful and effective. We were a little concerned at the reduction (\$50k to \$47k) that occurred post award but it turned out ok.

What would you recommend that the FGDC do differently?

The only thing we can think of would be to address or eliminate the potential for award reduction (see previous response). Communication, documentation and other aspects of the program are all quite effective.

Are there factors that are missing or additional needs that should be considered?

Not that we can think of.

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed, such as the time frame?

No.

If you were to do this again, what would you do differently?

Projects always take more time and effort than one first thinks. In retrospect we'd dedicate more time to the project. We think this about every project though...

More information on GIS activities and coordination in Oregon is available online: <http://gis.oregon.gov>

Questions? Contact: Cy Smith (503) 378-6066, cy.smith@state.or.us

Milt Hill (503) 378-3157, milton.e.hill@state.or.us