



## PAMAGIC WebEX: 01/21/10

Attendees: Dave Gilbert, Eric Jespersen, Melissa Hinton, Paul DeBarry, Kathryn Reed, Bill Kiger, Mike Shillenn, Laura Simonetti, Glenn McNichol, Glenn Mohler, Mark Stivers, Barry Hutchins, Stacey White, Kristin Woellmer, Ray Wolf, Gary Milbrand, Brady Stroh, Will Stevens

---

### Council / Congress

Office of Admin comments

The revised draft bill adds the executive director of Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) entity as a voting member of the council. The Office of Administration owns the PASDA contract with Pennsylvania State University and this entity is funded by the Office of Administration. There is no such title as executive director of PASDA and we do not recommend having Commonwealth contracted resources sitting on the council as a voting member due to conflict of interests this would impose. Additionally, the draft legislation already includes a seat for State-related academic institution. A more appropriate place for PASDA on the council would be as an informant member on an ad-hoc type of committee that voting council members have authority to create at will.

Brady: PASDA is a Penn State entity and is currently funded by OA. Therefore they are not necessarily owed by OA just currently funded by them. Stacey: since Universities already have a seat on the council PASDA would still be redundant.

The revised draft bill introduces the private sector as a voting member of the council. It is imperative that current private industry relationships continue to be fostered and new relationships established. Their guidance and advice is necessary to aide voting council members with decision making. Private industry should be represented on the council as non-voting informant members through a business type of committee that council voting members have authority to create at will.

This comment came from state policy makers. Many on the call felt this to be a show stopper

The Executive Branch Secretary's listed in the draft legislation should receive at a minimum two votes given the fact that the draft legislation includes two votes for House members and two votes for Senate members.

Executive would also like 2 seats. Mike Shillenn: essentially the Governor can appoint 9 to the panel from a variety of positions.

We are seeking clarification on the quorum. The draft legislation lists eleven members of the council shall constitute a quorum. However, the council membership includes seventeen voting members. Typically, half the voting membership plus one constitutes a quorum.

Several people had questions about verbiage on this

In regards to the powers and duties of the council, specifically the establishment of interoperability and architecture standards as listed within the draft legislation -- the council is advisory and legislation should reflect this specific power and duty as being advisory. The Geospatial Technologies Office within the Office of Administration develops and deploys geospatial technology investments, establishes data development priorities, architecture standards and interoperability and provides data sharing and coordination for state government. Unless this power and duty of the council is corrected to reflect "advisory", we can anticipate a duplication of effort and confusion by interested agencies and the public.

The solicitation of information from private business as described in the draft legislation would impose a conflict of interest for commonwealth agencies given they are bound by procurement codes and policies.

The source and use of the Pennsylvania Mapping and Geospatial Technologies Fund prompts a number of concerns. As proposed, the Fund may accept grants, donations, appropriations and contributions from anyone, including consultants and software vendors. We have serious concerns regarding the actual or potential conflicts of interest this arrangement will create. As commonwealth agencies we could not participate in an entity that does not have strict protocols regarding the way in which funds, including gifts and donations, are received and those protocols must meet our code of conduct and ethics act standards.

The use of the word solicitation will need to be revised. Stacey will look into alternative text

The draft legislation implies that the Office of Administration will supply all necessary assistance to the council in carrying out its duties and responsibilities. Given we are in the same economic crisis as the Nation, we do not have an endless supply of resources to support such a strong statement. The Office of Administration needs to respond to the needs of the public and in particular, citizens, and priorities are driven by the Administration. Therefore, we can only agree to provide the council with support as feasible and within our resource means.

Some reduction in the expectation should be incorporated.

#### **CCAP:**

CCAP will not be able to provide an official position on the draft legislation at this time. Although CCAP supports the concept of a PA GIS Council, the language in the draft legislation is different from legislation that was previously introduced and supported by CCAP. Due to the differences, it has been determined that before a CCAP position is provided, the draft will have to be considered

by the CCAP committees related to GIS services. We will let you know when a position is available but do expect that there would be language revisions needed.

**URISA Member & MPO Staffer:**

I believe we should support the bill but add the request that it be amended to include a GIS Department MPO staffer.

**APA-PA Board Member:**

The bill looks good. There seems to be a lot of people involved besides the 9 member council, like all those ex officio members. I guess that is normal. I think it is missing language as to how this council will carry out their mission. Will they meet in an office? Will they each need a laptop in front of them? If so, will a laptop be provided by the Commonwealth?

I see that the Office of Administration will supply the necessary assistance. I guess that office is in a physical space somewhere in Harrisburg. I just wonder if computers are available for the members and wouldn't the members need to have a computer if they are retrieving data to make available to whatever they are working on? I don't see this committee as your typical think tank. I see it as a more hands on group gathering information out there in cyberspace instead of creating policy.

One last thought. I think it is appropriate to replace the word chairman with chairperson. Thanks for your interest in what I think.

**URISA – CAC:**

Two points:

#1) I'm sure politics was involved, but my only comment is that 18 committee members (+6 nonvoting ex officio members) on a committee is about '6' too many -- I'd personally aim for '10' to '12' members on the committee (and move the others either 'off' or to 'nonvoting ex officio members').

#2) xxxxx (h)1 (page 5, line 4) (the 'xxxx' because I've lost track of the numbering scheme in the document) "..., and architecture standards for data sharing" -- I think "data exchange standards" would be a better definition here than 'architecture standards'. Architectural standards locks you into particular environments (software, hardware, and/or methodology), which may be the 'best' standard 'now' but a pretty 'bad' standard five years from now. Data exchange standards define how you move (or share) data in a consistent manner but allows significantly more flexibility in the actual method each organization chooses to physically 'store' and 'use' the data.

**C. Wayne Sweikert, P.L.S.:**

I believe that the legislation proposed is an excellent step forward and the comments and ideas generated from the GIS "congress" were pertinent and applicable.

My only contention and I wouldn't label this as either a "deal-breaker" or an "I would like to have", but rather as somewhere between those choices, is that I strongly believe that there should be a minimum of one member designated to the Council from the Pennsylvania Society of Land Surveyors (PSLS). The expertise and perspective from a professional land surveyor is extremely important with regard to setting, verifying, and documenting the levels of accuracy of the cartographic elements of GIS development.

**David G. Smith PE PLS:**

I just spoke with Andy Hilt at PLS, for him the deal breaker is that PLS does not have a seat at the table in this iteration. I'm hoping he will work through PaMAGIC on this, though he wants to go direct to Fairchild. Ideally, I am hoping we can get that reconciled with PLS so as to avoid any appearance of controversy.

**Tom Mueller, CAL U.:**

I think the Academic part needs to be open to all faculty or at least PASSHE and PA - state related (due to the issues of state funding, etc.) One term could be a PA state related and another term could be a PASSHE, etc. Again I am not saying we need to be on the board, but we should be eligible. If not, I think you are going to get PASSHE faculty thinking - what is wrong with us, why cannot we sit on this board, we are more controlled by the state then PA - State related. We are more based on teaching (PASSHE) while they are more interested in research (PA - State related) of course PSU - Harrisburg is more like PASSHE. However this decision could really cause a rift in academia and ONE of the great things about this movement is that EVERYONE seems united.

I hope this makes sense. Again these are just my thoughts on why this needs to be changed. Bob Martin may have an additional reasoning.

Finally, I am not saying we need to be on the board or that we understand certain issues that PA - state related do not. I am just saying in this bill, the bill that is uniting the GIS community we should be eligible to sit on the board

Suggestion to Tom from John Palatiello:

Perhaps Garth can be asked to change the provision to simply provide for a seat from an individual experienced in the geospatial field in the employ of a Pennsylvania university, college or community college, as such terms are defined in 22 Pa Code 31.2

<http://www.pacode.com/secure/data/022/chapter31/s31.2.html>

**Anonymous:**

Departmental secretaries on the board should be allowed to vote (or they won't attend!). Also, the Bureau of Topographic and Geologic Survey should have a seat. You might consider the same with PennDOT.

I would suggest putting the administrative end in a neutral state agency, perhaps PHMC?

**Next PAMAGIC meeting: January 27<sup>th</sup> At 1pm at the Four point Sheraton, near Harrisburg**