

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council



Meeting Date: March 16, 2016

Time: 10:30am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Attendees: Brady Callahan, OPRD; Jim Rue, Chair, DLCD; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Eric Hiebenthal, BLM; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Jacob Edwards, DOGAMI; Daniel Stoelb, OEM; Michael Gurley, OEM; Theresa Burcsu, CIO GEO

Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Chair, Jim Rue at 10:30am.
- Minutes from December approved by acclamation.
- No additional agenda items were added.

GPL Report – Randy Sounhein

Randy was not able to attend the OGIC meeting, but he submitted the following GPL report:

In a [Dec 2015 GPL report](#) to OGIC, GPL brought forward the concept of Authoritative Data and Data sources in a document and suggested the following terms related to the topic:

- Framework Authoritative Data
- Rational Authoritative Data
- Expert Authoritative Data

In addition, the subject matter was also presented at the Dec Framework Forum where the usage of the term raised issues by a County Surveyor since the term had already been referenced in the land surveying statute (ORS 672). OGIC advised GPL in December to take the matter up with OSBEELS to get their input and acceptance. OSBEELS had no objection to the use of the term, and this feedback was forwarded along to GPL which then suggested revising the document (see additions underlined in red) to include the following related to Rational Authoritative Data:

Many state and local agencies, and even non-governmental organizations, create data sets due to regulatory or statutory mandates. They may not participate in the Framework program review and approval process, but may also be considered authoritative data. For example, licensed land surveyors create geospatial data in the form of surveys. According to ORS 672.005, licensed land surveyors, engineers, and photogrammetrists are the authoritative sources for the creation of maps and geo-referenced databases representing the legal locations for property boundaries, the location of fixed works, or topography.

These updates address the needs of professional surveying, as well as other professions. GPL thus believes that it is possible to use the term 'authoritative' within multiple disciplines, as long as any related statutes are appropriately referenced.

PAC recently reviewed the Authoritative Data document and worked out a flowchart process that mirrors the Framework standards process. This process is something that OGIC might consider for the future. While this is a great start, the process could possibly undergo further vetting/review by all

GPL membership, as well as possibly be reviewed/presented at the next Framework forum.

In Jan 2016, GEO and DLCD moved forward with a study regarding the feasibility of a GIS Shared Service concept. GPL receives updates on this activity at our monthly meetings. A survey was sent out to GIS managers/Coordinators and the results came back (not reported here). GEO and DLCD are looking to work with 5-6 agencies for a pilot study to test the concept. The criteria for which agencies to be selected and how the process will work is yet to be established.

GPS Committee Participation – Cy Smith

The Chair of the Oregon Coordinate System Administrative Rule Advisory Committee requested that OGIC submit a nominee to replace Matt Taylor, Oregon Department of Revenue. OGIC has had a representative on this Committee for several years. The Committee requested someone who has familiarity with the Oregon Coordinate Reference System low distortion projections.

A motion was made and seconded to nominate Brady Callahan, OPRD GIS Manager and FIT Imagery Chair, to serve as the official OGIC representative on the Committee. Brady indicated he was willing to accept the nomination. The motion was passed by acclamation. OGIC will send a letter to the Committee Chair officially nominating Brady to serve as the OGIC representative.

Brady elaborated a bit on the work of the Committee, as follows:

The Committee deals specifically with OARs around the Oregon Coordinate Reference System. They will be adding new zones to the system in preparation for the 2022 coordinate system data migration that is coming from the National Geodetic Survey. Two sessions ago, the Legislature moved the Oregon Coordinate Reference System out of statute and into administrative rules to make it easier to modify as the need arises. Brady indicated that Mark Armstrong with NGS is Oregon's geodetic advisor and operates in close coordination with ODOT.

Data Sharing Legislative Concept – Sean McSpaden

Sean provided a short briefing on the status of HB4056, data sharing legislation that was introduced by the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology (JLCIMT) during the 2016 short session. The bill had an informational hearing, but there wasn't enough time to discuss the larger issues that are involved due to the nature of a short Legislative session. Jim Rue and Cy Smith testified in the informational hearing, as did Jerri Bohard with ODOT and Mark Tennyson with OEM. There was good discussion and interest from the Committee during the hearing.

The JLCIMT called for a joint JLCIMT/State CIO sponsored work group in the interim to develop a new legislative concept that the community could agree on. Cy and Sean will facilitate and lead the group. Sean laid out the structure of the work group and indicated it will be fairly informal. Sean handed out a [document](#) showing the general representation of the work group and the [roster](#) so far. We're waiting to hear back from several potential participants. He said that we would involve the legislative counsel attorney early on, and often, to avoid misinterpretations that occurred from that interaction in working out the language for HB4056.

The general schedule for the meetings has been established. First meeting will be April 8, then about every six weeks. GEO will set up an [informational web page](#) to capture the proceedings and documents generated by the work group. There are certain deadlines for legislative concepts established by the Legislature and we'll be trying to meet those deadlines, while keeping OGIC in the loop.

Cy mentioned that we'll need to keep the federal agencies in the loop, too, if we don't end up inviting one of more federal representatives to participate in one of the general participant categories. Sean indicated that there has been very good interest by all the potential participants that have been contacted. Cy talked about the notion of maintaining the concept of 'data custodian' that currently exists in Oregon law, as the only entity that can be compelled to provide access to a public record for which they are the custodian. We'll be working on a legislative concept that requires all public bodies to share geospatial Framework data with each other...not a requirement to place that data in the public domain, which would significantly complicate the effort. We'll need to have DOJ involved in this aspect, as well as many other aspects of the legislative concept.

Cy also mentioned the work that was done in 2002-2005 to modify the land surveying law. The work we're doing here mirrors that effort in many ways, including the establishment of a work group that developed a legislative concept and produced a statute (a modification to an existing statute in that case). The work group had a web page, which still exists on the GEO website, to capture and share all the documents and work they were doing. The group had to come up with talking points and communicate the effort with many other groups of stakeholders throughout the state. That group established a small sub-group at their first meeting, and that sub-group worked through a lot of detailed real-world examples to hammer out agreement on legislative language.

The examples helped deal with some of the objections that were raised by various stakeholders along the way. Dean suggested that we should think about asking someone from the Assessors Association to participate on the data sharing work group. Jim suggested that we should be sure to include someone that brings some of the negative perspectives and issues that were brought up relative to HB4056.

Sean mentioned the idea of having several possible sections in a new legislative concept, following the model of the Statewide Interoperability Executive Council, whereby OGIC would be given statutory authority, GEO and the State GIO would be given statutory authority, and public bodies would be required to share geospatial Framework data. Cy mentioned that a collaborative governance structure to define Framework data was something that received a lot of support during the discussion of HB4056, as opposed to the State CIO deciding what is Framework, how it would be shared, etc.

One of the key elements, mentioned in Sean's handout, is the statutory role of the State CIO, laid out in HB3099 passed in the last Session, to be the Governor's chief policy advisor on geospatial data and technology. Dean mentioned that he had talked with a number of county officials in counties that won't sign data sharing agreements, and they have invariably said they share data with anyone that asks, so there are complexities that the work group will have to uncover and understand.

Authoritative Data Governance – Theresa Burcsu, Cy Smith

The authoritative data definition document that OGIC commissioned from GPL is complete, with revisions noted above in the GPL report, and has been posted in the OGIC Review Materials page. The next step is to develop and agree on a work flow process whereby OGIC can identify and endorse authoritative data and data sources.

The PAC has been working on such a process and it was presented by Theresa Burcsu at this meeting. It is also posted in the [OGIC Review Materials](#) page. The process mirrors the process and work flow used by the Framework Implementation Team to develop Framework data content and exchange standards and send them to OGIC for endorsement, then on to the State CIO for

approval. The Framework Implementation Teams for each data theme would develop a case that lays out the justification for a given Framework data element and data source to be considered authoritative. There will be a template for these cases that will guide their development by the FIT teams, so that they are similar to each other and contain all the proper content.

It was suggested that there will likely be issues determining authoritative data for a particular purpose. That will be key for the narrative developed in each case statement in the process. An inventory of all fire hydrants in a jurisdiction could be produced by the city public works office and that could be the authoritative data and source for certain purposes. But fire hydrants are fixed works and the precise location of each fire hydrant is the purview, by statute, of a licensed surveyor, so that is the authoritative data and source for certain purposes. There are complexities that will have to be understood in developing the case statements for each Framework data element.

OGIC will be asked to provide feedback on this work flow process, with the hope of finalizing it at either the June or September OGIC meetings. The PAC will remain involved in reviewing any suggested changes to the process. Once the process is finalized, we will begin testing it with a few data elements to see how it works.

OGIC Executive Order – Jim Rue

OGIC worked on a revised Executive Order last year and approved the revisions by email between the June and September 2015 meetings. With the changes made to the State CIO's role by HB3099, the path to get to the Governor to get the EO signed has changed. The State CIO has now suggested that it might make more sense to take a different path for OGIC authorization. As mentioned earlier in the meeting, the notion of statutory authorization for OGIC has been raised by a number of folks related to the data sharing legislation. The State CIO has suggested that having OGIC operate under his authority makes sense to him and could provide a continuing close connection as we pursue GIS shared services across state government, centered at DLCD.

A combination of those two ideas, with OGIC having statutory authority and placed under the authority of the State CIO, as the Governor's chief geospatial policy advisor, seems to make some sense and is a direction we're pursuing. Jim talked about the work of the Enterprise IT Group and their interest in shared services for things like HR, accounting, payroll, etc. They have also been very interested in exploring shared services for GIS.

Some concern was expressed by OGIC members that we could lose something important by moving away from a Governor's Executive Order. Cy said he expected OGIC would have a charter that would lay out the details of OGIC operations, beyond whatever statutory authority we gain through the data sharing legislation. He indicated that statutory authority would help us with the broader enterprise we have always been trying to coordinate and collaborate with, beyond state government.

Some concerns remain with the role of the State CIO, and with the need to broaden OGIC to include other participants that haven't been included before, to provide more equitable representation. Raising the stature and visibility of OGIC is important, especially now that we're trying to accomplish Framework data sharing across the enterprise in a way that doesn't just rely on good will. We've accomplished a lot with cooperation and enlightened self-interest, but we've probably hit the wall in terms of how much more we can do...and there are currently significant gaps in what we can do together. Looking at other states for models is a good thing to do. Arkansas is a good example of a Council that has statutory authority and has been very successful.

HB3099 is the first time geospatial data and GIS technology has been mentioned in Oregon statutes.

The next logical step is to provide statutory authority for the Council to provide a higher level of visibility and stature, enabling the Council to achieve the vision that is currently captured in the Executive Order. Sean talked about a bit of the history of the SIEC and the use of that Council as a model for providing statutory authority for OGIC. We should look more closely at how the SIEC operates, perhaps at the next meeting.

The GEO funding model was discussed to some extent. The funding model now is based on an assessment against every state agencies budget. The State CIO has asked OGIC to look at GEO's funding model and recommend whether it should be changed or not, and how. There would seem to be three options: (1) leave it as it is; (2) ask for an appropriation that would replace the assessment; (3) hybrid model that would be partially based on assessment and part on appropriation.

Jim would like this to be on the June agenda, with the idea that if there is to be a Policy Option Package, it needs to happen soon. Cy mentioned the [Financial Options document](#) that was produced as part of the 2006 business case. That document contains a wide variety of possible funding options that could be evaluated as part of a hybrid model, including use of small portions of existing fees, debt financing, etc. That document is posted here.

Sean mentioned that he has been looking at the possibility of capturing the Esri costs in advance, rather than having that money passed through to GEO from each participating agency and then on to Esri, with the significant administrative costs that go along with it. Jim mentioned that an appropriation for GEO would help raise the stature of OGIC and GEO.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04pm.

Next meeting:

June 15, 2015

10:30am - Noon

155 Cottage St. Conf. Room A