RECAP
Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: January 19, 2018

Time: 8:00am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Member Attendees: Cy Smith, GEO; Dean Anderson, Oregon URISA; Allyson Ford, OHA Public Health; Dave Stuckey, OMD; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept.; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications Agency; Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; Jim Rue, DLCD; Lisa Gaines, OSU-INR; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Patrick Gronli, NW Natural Gas; Jeff Fronkja, Portland Metro; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Steven Hoffert, OYA
Staff/Observers: Dennis Ruth, OMD; Jed Roberts, DGMI; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Rachel Smith, DLCD; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Mike Harryman, Governor's Office; Alex Pettit, State CIO

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Cy Smith at 8:00am. With 16 of the 21 voting OGIC members present, a quorum was established for conducting business.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- No additions to the agenda were made or requested. No announcements made.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair- All

The legislation indicates that the Council will select a Chair and Vice Chair. Question was asked about how long the term would be. The term for the Council membership is four years, but it would probably make sense to have a shorter term for Chair and Vice Chair. Question was asked about role and level of effort for Chair and Vice Chair. Cy said working up agenda, facilitating Council meetings, ensuring all voices are heard. There is support from GEO and State CIO for the Council, so that will reduce the work for the Chair position.

Suggestion made to table the discussion and decision about Chair and Vice Chair until after the break during this Council meeting.

The discussion was resumed on this matter after the break, at which time Lisa Gaines read portions of a document she had found online about suggested roles for Chair and Vice Chair. That material is attached to these notes here. After some further discussion about potential roles and level of effort related to the Chair and Vice Chair positions, Jeff Fronkja was nominated as Chair for a two year term and Kay Erickson was nominated as Vice Chair. The nominations were accepted, a motion was made and seconded to approve the selections of Jeff as Chair and Kay as Vice Chair, and the vote was unanimous in favor. There was brief discussion about staggering the roles of the Chair and Vice Chair, with the Chair having a two year term and the Vice Chair having a three year term.

Charter Deliberations – All

Cy walked the Council through the draft Charter document section by section, as members asked questions and noted proposed revisions. Quite a bit of the direction for the Charter comes from HB2906. The proposed revised draft Charter is attached to these notes here, with changes based on the notes below.

No changes suggested in the Mission or Goals sections. One addition to the last bullet of the Objectives section. Question asked about the intent of the last bullet under the Stakeholders, Customers, and Beneficiaries related to private corporations. Cy said the intent was to include private corporations that provide support to public bodies in development or managing Framework data, not those that use Framework data, which would be a much larger group. The focus of the Legislature in HB2906 was to enable Framework data sharing between public bodies, not on broader data sharing with the public or with private corporations. Suggestion made to clarify that bullet. Suggestion made to change second bullet in Stakeholder section to Oregonians to eliminate citizenship issue. Question asked about intent to include non-Oregon private corporations, and change made in revised draft to include such.

In Success Indicators section, proposed addition to advocate for adequate resources for data sharing. Question asked about whether the last bullet was too broad, and might be construed as eliminating fees more broadly. Agreed to add clarification to eliminate possible confusion along those lines. Concern raised about success indicators reflecting only what the Council can accomplish, and not go beyond that. Suggested that indicators need to be measurable. Decided to change the title of this section. No changes requested in Feedback Plan Elements section. Two changes suggested in Issues Statement section, as made in revised draft. Removed 'waste' to eliminate negative perception.

Suggestion made and agreed to remove several sections in the draft Charter and include those sections in the strategic plan, called for in HB2906 as enacted. Sections to be removed from Charter before it is finalized include Objectives, Vision (Success Indicators), Issues Statement. Suggested to add to Charter that one responsibility of the Council is to develop and adopt a strategic plan and budget. Revised draft will reflect those changes, but notes capture earlier ideas for inclusion in strategic plan.

Suggestion made to confirm that Duties of Council section should include what is in statute without taking anything away. Suggestion made to try to separate and identify the roles of the Council related to Framework and related to geospatial information in general. Perhaps separate out the specific duties from the more general duties. Procedures and Meeting Frequency section accepted, but suggestion made to acknowledge existence and structure of certain standing committees and their connection and reporting relationship with OGIC. Details of each standing committee and work group will be in the charters for those specific groups.

Decision Making Process section has language about making decisions electronically between meetings. There is a process for doing that for public meetings. Cy will find out what that process is and may revise this section if needed to include details of that process. Suggestion made to include specific language in this section about alternate representation at Council meetings. Point was made that allowing alternates could be problematic and had been problematic for OGIC in the past. Point made that legislation indicates that voting member is the member appointed by the Governor, which probably settles this issue. But we will add this to the Charter.

Council Membership section came directly from the statute. Suggestion made to post Charter revisions so they can be reviewed by Members and others and add that to the Charter Review/Revision Process section.

Adoption of Charter tabled, changes will be made and revised version sent out for approval before next Council meeting.

Background and Context – Cy Smith

Presentation made by Cy and posted here, to provide background and context for the Council. Key

point taken up in Stakeholder meetings to develop HB2906 was that it will be important for the Council to evaluate Framework data to determine what data elements should be considered Framework and to prioritize Framework data development. The Framework Implementation Teams (advisory committees) that currently exist are right now in the process of conducting that evaluation and will report their results to OGIC to guide the Council in determining what Framework is and what is most important. Another key point is that the intent of the legislation is to build out Framework data statewide, and that result will enable consistent service provision for government services statewide.

2019 Policy Option Package – Cy Smith

Cy presented a draft Policy Option Package (budget package) for the 2019-21 biennium to support GEO. It includes additional funding for three new positions and one-time expenses for additional equipment, all related to the data sharing legislation. This budget package is separate from the larger funding or resource challenge related to consistent statewide development of Framework data. The part of the document highlighted in yellow is the portion for which suggestions from the Council would likely be most useful for the State CIO's office, but suggestions from members for the language in other parts of the document are certainly welcome.

Question asked about the rationale for reclassing the existing ISS6 to an ISS8, answer is that the position is now working out of class doing considerable multi-organization and multi-jurisdiction coordination, in addition to high level technical work, and has started doing some strategic planning related to ArcGIS Online. Suggestion made that it may be premature to add three staff positions now when the data sharing doesn't start until January 2020. Point made in response that this budget wouldn't take effect until July 1, 2019, six months prior to the data sharing becoming effective, and that we would need additional staff to prepare for that to happen six months later. Point made by several state agency members that the number of staff and resources requested seems low for the services to be provided. Point made that the Council needs to support sufficient funding for the data sharing mandate in the legislation. Point made that we will need to justify this proposal and other funding proposals related to data sharing in view of the fact that we are saying we will be saving money, even though we need a short term increase. Point made that one of the key aspects of the bill is about increasing local government capacity and we need to characterize what we are proposing in that vein.

The State agency assessment would be increased to include the ongoing cost of additional staff. Point made that state agencies will need to weigh this proposal against other proposed increases to their DAS assessment. Point made that there needs to be more work done to evaluate the need for more staff and provide a stronger rationale. Cy reminded the Council that this is a preliminary draft and it is expected that considerably more work needs to be done to finalize this proposal. Point made that OPA4 positions could also provide business analysis needed to produce business plans for Framework data development, or at least help the Framework advisory committees do that kind of business analysis.

Cy indicated that the OPA4 would most likely be the position working closely with local government partners around data sharing, with the existing OPA4 continuing to work on overall Framework coordination and working with state, tribal and federal partners. The additional ISS6 position will be needed to help with technical aspects of secure data sharing between public bodies. There will likely be several thousand users that will need secure access to Framework data through a central source (GEO), and that is not something we can do with the staff we currently have. The AS2 would help with communication, as well as administrative tasks. Point made that AS2 is probably too low a classification to prepare communication materials and manage Council and GEO communications. The budget package has to be completed sometime in July 2018, so the Council will see this on the

agenda for the April and July meeting. The State CIO will approve this first and the approved budget package will be forwarded on through the DAS budget process and then to the Governor for final approval. So the Council is asked to advise the State CIO on this budget package and that advice needs to be submitted no later than the July OGIC meeting.

Funding Mechanism for Framework Data Sharing – Jeff Fronkja

Jeff Fronkja led the Funding Mechanism discussion and presented slides posted here. He talked initially about some of the work that was done and discussions that were had in the Stakeholder Work Group that developed the bill in 2016, and the work that was done by a subgroup that the Work Group initiated to specifically dig into the funding mechanism issue. Point made that federal grants could be used to initiate some activities. Point made that debt financing could potentially be used. Legislature has a policy statement in place that indicates data should be managed as an asset, which could lead to debt financing as a viable option.

Point made that making a cost avoidance case, particularly across levels of government, is very difficult partly because it's very difficult to establish a base from which to measure cost avoidance. And most organizations aren't going to go along with the notion that they are wasting money as an individual organization. The waste happens across public bodies. If we were able to identify efficiencies and thus savings, it is likely those efficiencies wouldn't result in funds going back to the legislative bodies for reallocation. The point is that a cost avoidance argument is probably not one we want to try to make.

Suggestion made that the Council should establish a work group to come up with recommendations for the Council to evaluate related to the funding mechanism issue. Point made that we need to give that work group some guidance, particularly related to the various types of mechanisms to examine. Point made that we may want to look at solutions that are specific to different types of data, rather than a one size fits all approach, with the examples in mind of the different mechanisms used now for ORMAP, 911, and road centerlines. Point made that the work group should take a close look at how we currently fund GIS data development. Point made that the work group needs to determine the funding gap between what we currently spend and what we need. Should be framed based on different needs for different data themes. Suggestion made to ask for help on this activity from the CFO as soon as possible. FIT advisory committee will have input for the work group on data needs and prioritization. GEO will help with the work of identifying what is being spent on Framework data development now.

Work group needs a clear understanding of scope of activity: revenue source identification; how much is being spent now; how is/should funding be allocated. Suggestion to have work group identify methods to eliminate fees charged by public bodies to each other for Framework data and come back with recommendations to Council at April meeting, then move to larger issue of funding Framework data development statewide as time and resources allow. Point made that if we stick to what needs to be done to eliminate the fees between public bodies, we could miss the boat in terms of getting funding for Framework development…and those fees are charged to fund Framework development.

Volunteers for funding work group: Jeff Fronkja, Patti Sauers, Dean Anderson, Dave Stuckey (+1), Kay Erickson (+1), Steven Hoffert, Jim Rue (+1)

Tracking Indicators – Theresa Burcsu

Theresa made a presentation attached to these notes here. The Legislature will want to know how we are going to track our progress toward Framework development and toward the savings and efficiencies we are proposing will occur. The timeline for this activity is not as tight as the other

activities. Theresa suggested that this activity can begin after the funding identification, and possibly the strategic planning, activities have taken place, as information from those activities will provide input to the tracking indicators activity. She thought this activity would probably start in August 2018. Point made that it would be very useful to find a proxy that would help us determine the impact that consistent, sustainable, high quality Framework data has on important business processes, such as wildfire response or improving health outcomes for Oregonians. Point made that indicators should derive from the mission, goals and objectives of the organization. Sean made the point that the Legislature is interested in tracking indicators, but they are more heavily influenced by powerful stories and we should also be working on such stories.

A work group was established to work on this activity. Volunteers for tracking indicators work group: Allyson Ford, Patrick Gronli, Molly Earle, Lisa Gaines (+1)

There were a few folks that indicated a desire to work on strategic planning, which we had to pull from this agenda for time.

Strategic Planning work group: Jerri Bohard, Lisa Gaines, (I think there was one more but not sure)

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

Next Meeting
April 27, 2018, Noon – 4:00pm
Conference Room A, Executive Office Building
155 Cottage St. NE, Salem, OR 97301