

Notes from 4-2-08 Meeting of Street Centerline-Address Advisory Committee
notes by Larry Zink

Attendance:

Rose Braun, NDOR
Mike Neidermeyer, NDOR
Jeff McReynolds, Lancaster Cty
Jim Langtry, USGS
Chad Boshart, NEMA
Joan Raffety, PSC
Eric Herbert, Sarpy Cty
Terry Pell, NSP
Steve Henderson, OCIO
Larry Zink, OCIO & GIS Council

Report from Technical Working Group. A brief report from the Technical Working Group basically affirmed the validity of using the Oregon/Washington/Idaho standards as a beginning template for our work. It was noted that there were several issues identified for further discussion, but general affirmation of standards. Rose Braun is in communication with the Oregon/Washington Group to follow up on some of the identified issues. This Working Group has scheduled a follow-up meeting on Wed., April 16th, 1:30 at the State Patrol Headquarters.

Revised Draft Project Charter. Larry reported that he has revised the original draft of the Project Charter based on his notes from the last meeting of the Adv. Cmte. and posted the revision online at: http://www.cio.nebraska.gov/gis/advisory_committees/StrAdd/index.html The changes mainly relate to the Technical Working Group, decision-making processes and timelines. Larry noted that his notes were not very clear relative to Jeff Pursley's comments about the need to discuss a possible restriction on commercial use of the data. Larry wasn't clear as to whether this was adequately included in the Policy Issues bullet point of "Data sharing agreements, commitments, and restrictions" or whether there was a felt need for an addition bullet point to specifically highlight this issue. Joan Raffety offered to seek clarification from Jeff on this point. Larry indicated that because he had not been able to get this revised draft to folks prior to the meeting, that the Adv. Cmte. should defer any further action on adopting the Charter until the next meeting.

Identification of Policy Issues for Discussion. Larry noted that the Adv. Cmte. had determined at its last meeting that the full Adv. Cmte. would discuss and tackle the policy issues, while the Technical Working Group would take on the technical issues. The Adv. Cmte. reviewed the draft list of policy issues that Larry had prepared and determined that they were pretty comprehensive. It was also determined that the order of listing was also appropriate for a discussion sequence.

- ◆ Data model and standards
- ◆ Data sharing agreements, commitments, and restrictions
- ◆ Data development and maintenance plans/commitments
- ◆ Delineation of agency responsibilities and commitments
- ◆ Identification and empowerment of lead agency
- ◆ Funding strategies and justifications

- ◆ Business case development
- ◆ Plans/commitments for undeveloped data elements
- ◆ Plans/commitments for undeveloped areas

Data model and standards. It was noted that this topic area is also on the list of items for the Technical Working Group and that it was probably appropriate to defer this discussion until the Adv. Cmte. had a fuller report and recommendations from the Technical Working Group.

Data sharing agreements, commitments, and restrictions. It was discussed and generally affirmed that the model upon which we were proceeding was based upon the assumption that each of the five major data producers (PSC, NDOR, Douglas, Sarpy, and Lancaster Counties) would continue to develop and maintain street centerline-address data as they currently are and that they will provide this to this enterprise-level effort without costs. Any additional data development or changes in these data-producing agencies efforts or data would need to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

The outstanding concerns of PSC about restricting the possibility of commercial exploitation of data developed by PSC via cellular user fee were noted. It was also noted that PSC has stated that it has no concerns about sharing data with other public agencies. The group discussed the potential implications of efforts to restrict commercial exploitation given the practical reality of making this data available via a online GIS portal and mapping service. On one end of the continuum would be some type of a pop-up statement that would indicate that the data was not available for resale (with ultimately enforcement likely to be either just the honor system or a PSC initiative). On the other end of the spectrum could be a password protected access. Such a password protection system would require a considerable management overhead. For such a fundamental dataset, one could reasonably expect request for access for multiple people from any given local government and for any state or federal agency. Questions was raised about the extent to which the limited market demand/value for data outside the urban areas would offset the administrative hassles/costs of restricting access. It was ultimately noted that this is an issue upon which each data producing organization must make a judgment. As a practical matter, since Joan Raffety was not in a position to make comments on behalf of PSC on this policy matter, it was decided that Larry Zink and Steve Henderson would seek to arrange a meeting with folks at PSC to explore this issue further.

The issue was also raised about the need for some type of liability disclaimer related to online access.

Data development and maintenance plans/commitments. As was noted previously, the group is proceeding on the assumption that current commitments by the five major data producers to maintain the data as they are currently doing and provide it at no cost to this enterprise effort is a key assumption of the project. Any additional work required by these data producers based on a finally adopted data model and standards would need to be negotiated on a case-by-case. It was decided that further discussion of these issues would probably be more productive after the Technical Working Group had made its recommendations on Data Model and Standards and had identified the additional efforts that might be needed to bring the existing data into conformity with that model and standards.

Delineation of agency responsibilities and commitments. It was determined that this policy area closely follows the items above and it would be most efficient to defer until further reports and recommendations from the Technical Working Group.

Identification and empowerment of lead agency. The discussion of this area noted that it appeared that there were currently only three agencies for which it seemed there was any possibility of being the lead agency for the data integration/stewardship role. Those agencies were the PSC, NDOR, or the OCIO. Each of the three had strengths and weaknesses and that there was no obvious choice. Jeff McReynolds made the case that there was considerable potential for synergy between this enterprise street centerline-address effort and the enterprise Geospatial Data Sharing portal effort being both hosted by the OCIO. It was noted that this was a policy-level decision that needed to be made by agency management folks who were not at the table today. It was decided that Larry Zink and Steve Henderson would see to arrange meetings with PSC and NDOR management folks to further frame these issues and seek an answer to this fundamental question prior to the Adv. Cmte's next meeting.

Review of "To Do Lists".

Joan Raffety will seek to clarify from Jeff Pursley whether there is a felt need to have an additional bullet in the Project Charter, under "Policy Issues" related to discussing commercial exploitation of the data or whether it was adequately highlighted by the bullet that read, "Data sharing agreements, commitments, and restrictions".

Larry Zink and Steve Henderson will seek to arrange two policy level meetings with PSC and NDOR.

Arrange a meeting between OCIO and PSC to discuss (probably include Mike Hybl, Jeff Pursley, Angela Melton):

- ◆ NSP offer to partner with PSC on directionality correction
- ◆ PSC interest in being steward of street centerline-address dataset for enterprise
- ◆ PSC requirements for data access restrictions (e.g. prevention of commercial use)

Arrange for a meeting between OCIO and NDOR to discuss:

- ◆ Who should take the lead in data stewardship on statewide street centerline-address dataset (NDOR or OCIO)
- ◆ What do we need to do to maximize the utility of this initiative for NDOR's use? (GIS, county road maps, database links, etc.)(Check Steve Brown's document)

Everyone will review the current draft of the Project Charter and provide any feedback to Larry Zink, with the goal of adopting a Project Charter at the next meeting

http://www.cio.nebraska.gov/gis/advisory_committees/StrAdd/index.html

Next meeting: May 1st, 1:00 PM, USGS Water Science Center, 5231 South 19th Street, Lincoln