OGRIP Forum Meeting Notes
January 26, 2015
1:50 p.m.
ODOT Central Office, 1980 W. Broad Street, Room GA, Columbus, OH 43223

I. **Welcome & Introductions**
    a. Welcome and introductions were conducted by Jeff Smith with OGRIP. He welcomed Cheri Mansperger in her new role as Vice-Chair and let everyone know that Kyle Schaper, the Chair of the Forum was home with his new baby.
        Jeff and Cheri then spoke about the decision to not have a presenter and instead discuss in an open format where the FORUM is headed and if it meets the needs of the attendees and the Council as well.
    b. In attendance were:

Nelda Sisler-Buck	Maureen Grener	Jason Gillow
Larisa Kruger	Cheri Mansperger	Matt Thompson
Gary Penn	Cody Lupe	Lucas Heeter
John Puente	Scott Fierro	Brian Kienle
Jeff Smith	Kyle Schaper	Tom Fisher
Bret Allphin	Ian Kidner	Donna Podolak

II. **Acceptance of November 2014 Meeting Notes** – There was no acceptance of the notes at this meeting.

III. **Business**
    a. LBRS – There are no significant changes. Two counties are currently collecting data – they are Summit and Lorain. They will probably be completed by the end of this year. There are 8 counties remaining. Thru the Rules making process of the NG911, they may have to start using LBRS data if they would like to receive funding from the State. It may help to encourage the remaining counties to jump on board.
        OSIP – The 2014 one Ft. OSIP imagery was delivered on 12/19/14 for 22 counties in Southeast Ohio. It is being loaded to servers. It should be ready to be delivered to the counties by the end of the week. 54 counties purchased enhanced imagery or LiDar off the contract. Many have already purchased for this coming spring.
        OSIP III has been discussed with the Council. ODOT, DNR and DAS have been in discussions. This data is beneficial and useful to users and local governments. It was asked if it meets the next level up that the Feds are willing to fund? No it does not. Enhanced products allow the county to contract for their level of accuracy. No one has gone to Level QL2 Standard (Fed). It is expensive.
        County Profiles – Only one county is the last year has updated their profile so the Forum is being asked for input.

b.   GIS User Group Updates
   i.   <u>Ohio/Michigan</u> – nothing to report.
   ii.   <u>SWOGIS</u> – nothing to report.
   iii. <u>Ohio/KY/Cincinnati</u> – nothing to report.
   iv.   <u>GUONO</u> - nothing to report.
    v.   <u>Central Ohio User Group</u> – There is a meeting on February 18th, 2015 at MORPC from 2-4 pm.
   vi.   <u>Appalachia Ohio Geospatial Partnership</u> –There is a meeting this Thursday at the library in Cambridge Ohio. The Local Government Innovation Fund Project final report is due this week. It will be put on the website when complete.
   vii. <u>GIS for Strategic Asset Management</u> – The next meeting will be on February 19th, 2015.
   viii. <u>Ohio Valley Regional Development Commission</u> - Malcolm Meyer is the new contact for the OVRDC.

d.   Ohio URISA Update – nothing to report.
e.   Other Business –
   • Ian Kidner informed everyone that a new TIMS app will be rolling out and there will be training through the Ltap program for it. It will also be phone accessible.
   • Cheri, Kyle and Jeff have discussed changing up the presentation portion of this meeting to help the Council and promote statewide GIS. Some topics to review are:
     o LBRS – what goes in the attribute fields – things do not merge real well. There is no standardization.
     o Parcel Initiative
     o State and County Map Services Inventory
     o Experts on various GIS subjects – a Users and Consultants List
     o Statewide Parcel Data Standards

   What is the Council looking for? In the past, Task Forces have been set up for various items. Many of the recommendations from the Council have been based on Task Force recommendations. Would like to revisit this and look at things again.
   What is the best way to collect for datasets? Can the Council help the county if they don't have a dataset yet? Look at existing initiatives and give a report of local government activity and here is where they can use help. Survey should help with what is going on at that level, but the counties are not filling them out – it has 11 sections with 10-15 questions per section. Maybe it is too long. If something changes within the county, we do not know.

   A huge pressure to the Council currently is the Oil and Gas for private and state assessments for taxes. Pipelines touching townships that are therefore owed a tax disbursement and where the pipelines run. The Ohio Dept. of Taxation has asked the Council to look into this matter.

   It was asked if there was a way that OGRIP can help the "have not" counties so that everyone is on an equal playing field? Agencies offer their service, s but

some counties do not want to share data.   The OGRIP Council in code has no budget or no way to provide funds to local government. Identify a sustainable funding source at state level. Not a grant but a program model such as LBRS or OSIP – that does not exist within the Council currently. Parcels are a tough topic – ODOT/ODNR can't pay for all. Maybe shop around to other agencies for help with parcels – auditor – Board of Elections – Secretary of State - Cadastral Task Force with parcels across the board would provide better reporting back to State. ODOT has the best handle on municipal boundaries in the state. The question is how should these parcels or boundaries be split up? By tax district or special fire district? This has not been revisited in a long time. Having a Cadastral Task Force would be beneficial to the Council.

The OGRIP Council regulations in statute only maintain an inventory of state owned real property and provide to Treasurer of State. There is no funding. It is an unfunded mandate and difficult to do with 88 different standards for parcels. If there needs to be some regulatory or standards, then it would be better coming from local government instead of state government. An idea is to create work groups – general council questions and research.

The group would like to see panel discussions on topics such as Local Government Model, community maps and sharing with others. A clearer objective and structure would be beneficial for all.

Possibly a generic survey for hot topics should be done. Ask the Council what they feel are the hot topic areas. The Council is made up of 15 Governor appointed representatives. There has been an issue with getting vacancies filled. Proposed language changes to fill seats in the next biennium are being drafted. The new makeup of the council with the changes will be reflective of what the Governor would like to see.

Gary Penn spoke of a User Group that is important – looking at how data is collected. Looking at mobile technology and using it. See if the mobile technology items can last in the field and security issues that could occur.

Tom Fisher spoke of the "have not" counties. He would like to see logical division with sub-councils to take message and convey to local government officials so it comes from a familiar face to raise the awareness of OGRIP.

It was briefly proposed that the hot topics are currently:

1. Parcels & Boundaries
2. Data Sharing & Map Services Data
3. Technology
4. County Profiles

Map Services Work Group could tie in with Profiles Work Group. Would like to understand what data is available and how it is used. Would like to open up all local government to share data and open it up for everyone to use.

Would like the Task Force and Work Groups to meet prior to the OGRIP forum meeting and sometimes just have a work group instead of forum meeting. Reach out to the Counties for input.

Does everyone feel this is the best way to go instead of presentations at each meeting? Is everyone comfortable with this agenda? The User Groups are the proper forum for presentations.

V.   Adjourn –Next meeting on February 23, 2015.