RECAP
Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: July 23, 2018

Time: 8:00am – Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Member Attendees: Cy Smith, GEO; Dean Anderson, Oregon URISA; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept.; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications Agency; Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; Lisa Gaines, OSU-INR; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Patrick Gronli, NW Natural Gas; Steven Hoffert, OYA; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Rep. Mike Nearman, Oregon Legislature; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield

Staff/Observers: Pete Boone, Tualatin Valley Water District; Jed Roberts, DGMI; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Rachel Smith, DLCD; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Eadie Kaltenbacher, Marylhurst University; John Prychun, DOR; Terri Morganson, Esri

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Kay Erickson, Vice Chair, at 8:05am. With 13 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.
- Minutes from the April meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.
- Jeff made several comments regarding meeting logistics: Chair's primary duties are to make sure members are heard and that business gets conducted. He asked for hands to be raised to be recognized before speaking. He asked members to raise points of order if they have an issue with how things are going. He will make an effort to change hats when he's moving from his role as Chair to his role as representative of regional governments.

Charter Deliberations – All

The Council took up the draft Charter document which included proposed revisions from the previous meeting and interim suggestions. That proposed revised draft Charter is attached to these notes here. The group agreed with all proposed changes.

Jerri reminded us that there was an issue from the last Council meeting about what to do if the Chair wasn't discharging the responsibilities of the position appropriately. Cy had agreed to look at the Oregon URISA Chapter charter as a potential model on this issue and add appropriate language to the OGIC Charter. He didn't have time yet to do that. It was suggested that this would be part of the matter of replacing Council members that leave during their term, to be taken up by the Strategic Planning Work Group as part of the Strategic Plan.

Motion made and seconded to adopt the Charter, motion passed unanimously.

Funding Mechanism for Framework Data Sharing – Rachel Smith

Rachel Smith led the funding mechanism discussion and presented slides that are posted here. This represents progress made by the Resource Working Group (RWG) since the April OGIC

meeting to develop a recommendation on this issue, how to eliminate fees public bodies charge each other for Framework data, for Council decision making. A legislative concept placeholder has been filed in case any of the Council's recommendations require legislative action. Work group members will continue their effort to finalize research on 1) cost to complete Framework data statewide (gap analysis), 2) expenditures currently being made by public bodies on an annual basis to develop and maintain Framework data, and 3) fees currently being charged by public bodies to other public bodies for sharing Framework data. During the slide presentation, Theresa Burcsu presented work on cost to complete Framework data, Dean Anderson presented work on Framework expenditures by public bodies (report available describing assumptions), and Rachel presented some slides from Jeff Frkonja on fees charged by public bodies to other public bodies and costs for aggregating Framework data by regional public bodies.

The work group characterizes the full issue as a need to address the overall shortfall between current funding for Framework data and what is needed to complete and maintain it. This will provide efficiencies due to elimination of duplicated effort, which will allow public bodies to do more work. The value proposition for statewide Framework data development and maintenance, however, goes beyond eliminating duplicated effort. The work group proposes that the value proposition from statewide Framework data is provision of consistent government services by all public bodies across the state. See slides for other information regarding the RWG recommendation to OGIC.

Point made by John W. about the slide showing CoGs as an intermediary or aggregator for all cities and counties, that there are many cities and counties that don't require an intermediary or aggregator to provide Framework data to the central hub.

Tom Rohlfing noted that State has paid County Assessors at several times in the past to share tax lot data with state agencies. Dean indicated that Polk County uses a fee on real estate transactions to help fund making tax lot data available free of charge to the public.

Discussion on each of the recommended funding mechanisms summarized as follows:

Debt Financing

RWG proposing debt financing over an 8 year period of development to complete the work in a reasonable, accelerated timeframe. RWG working with Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) and State Chief Financial Officer (CFO) staff to determine what can be funded using debt financing. Preliminarily, it appears that we could fund the cost of hardware and software, as well as limited duration positions and contracted work for initial development of the program. It may or may not be possible to fund data development using debt financing. They have done that for 30 years in Massachusetts, and RWG is in contact with folks there to determine how they do it.

Questions and comments about types of debt instruments would be used. RWG has been looking at IT bonds, which mature in 5 years, and Q bonds, which mature in 30 years. We may have to use IT bonds for some expenses. There are other options that have not been explored yet. RWG has not been looking at repaying bonds using General Fund appropriations because there is a lot of competition for those kinds of general obligation bonds. Point made that the type of bond used should have a nexus with the problem to be solved. Point made that there could be an issue with P3 concept if State doesn't own the data we're financing.

Point made that we will need a strong business case to justify debt financing and for the program overall. Cy indicated that OGIC built a strong business case 12 years ago for what was basically the

same program we're proposing now. Much of that business case is still valid, although the numbers would need to be updated. Point made that we need to get that done as soon as possible.

Point made that we need to be clear about the efficiency of financing for this effort before we propose that approach. That point came up again in the discussion on existing fees.

Point made that capacity building in small, rural local bodies is a big, difficult task. RWG suggests that we would borrow a much smaller amount in the first two years to give us time to do the capacity building, and part of the capacity building for rural public bodies would likely be done with regional bodies that would do the work for a group of rural cities and counties.

Point made that we should at least consider asking for the POP in the 2019 session, but delay asking for the larger funding amounts until later. Suggestion that we could use the following two years to do more planning and preparation. Point made that we aren't quite ready to make the case to the Legislature today, but if we can get better prepared in the next six months, there are ways to characterize and sequence the ask such that the Legislature could be expected to approve a smaller amount of funding, perhaps with debt financing, in the first two years and phase in larger amounts as the preparation and capacity building becomes more tangible.

We will need to make the Legislature aware, regardless how we present the proposal and recommendation, that this is a multiple biennium effort. In addition to the business case, the Council has to have an implementation plan and timeline that fully describes how we intend to accomplish the work. Point made that we have a statute now that has certain demands and timelines that we have to address, whether we ask for everything all at once, or phase the effort, or whatever.

Point made that we need to be ready if the Legislature asks what we could do with less than what we've asked.

State Agency Assessments and [Policy Option Package (POP)](#)

Point made that one-time costs in POP could be bonded. If we added more positions as limited duration positions, those could be bonded over the 8 year period of development we've been discussing for debt financing. Ongoing costs in POP could not be bonded. If we remove costs from POP that could be bonded, the total amount of the POP would be reduced to about $1M. If we assume that we would stop spending $500K per biennium on Framework data from the state agency assessment, it would be possible to cut the amount of the POP in half again.

Point made that project management is a critical need for this program and should be brought on as early as possible when the funding is available. That would likely be the first limited duration position to be established. Point made that we could ask for permanent positions and make it clear that we wouldn't be filling them all immediately.

Task for OGIC related to POP is to provide feedback to the State CIO. Cy will compile what he's heard from the Council on the POP so far and get that back to the Council for review soon. Point made that it would likely be helpful to the success of the POP if the Council provided a statement to the State CIO and the Enterprise IT Governance Committee that OGIC supports the POP. Point made that the POP narrative needs to make the case that it is augmenting the capacity of state agencies and make it clear how the capacity represented by the POP is different than what state agency GIS staff regularly do.

Point made that we may need to rebalance our funding mechanisms and packages depending on whether we receive approval from the Executive branch and/or the Legislature for various pieces of our recommendation. We just need to work closely with CFO and LFO to ensure everyone is aware of all aspects of our recommendation and the dependencies of each aspect.

Portion of Existing Fees

Rachel presented three possible alternatives related to existing fees recommendation and asked for feedback.

1. Tap small portion of all fees – this would require a relatively smaller percentage, but requires a 3/5th vote of the Legislature. (Preferred by RWG)
2. Tap small portion of targeted fees that require Framework data – would require a relatively larger percentage, funds would be controlled by OGIC.
3. Same as 2, but funds would remain with fee administrators – Legislature would direct fee administrators as to expenditures.

Point made that fee administrators wouldn't necessarily have to raise their fees to pay for Framework data. In fact, most if not all are likely paying in some way for Framework data now if it's required to properly administer their fee. There's a value proposition for fee administrators to get the required data from a central source, updated regularly and from the authoritative sources.

Point made that an alternative would be to identify a smaller group of fees that are large enough to accommodate a $1 or $2 fee increase, instead of a 1% increase. That would be a smaller group of fee administrators that would need to be supportive, and the customers that pay the fees would likely not be further adversely affected by a $1 or $2 increase than they would by a 1% increase, if a 1% increase amounted to something like $0.20. We could accumulate the same amount of funding from a much smaller number of fee administrators, with less overall pain and trouble. This could also be a way to eliminate the need for debt financing. The example was to increase the cost of a $35 license by $1, as opposed to increasing it by $0.12. Potential to put agencies on notice that when they raise their fees, there will be an additional amount added to accommodate Framework data development and maintenance.

Point made there is a cost to fee administrators to increase fees, so they may need to take part of the fee increase to cover those costs, or to raise the fee a bit more to cover those costs. Point made that it could be a big task to tap a large number of a wide variety of fees and keep track of how all those funds are administered, distributed, etc. It would be easier to manage funds coming from a smaller number of fees, as suggested earlier in the discussion.

Point made that we could probably make a case for the need for Framework data for every fee, but the case would be less compelling for some than others. Point made that we are not looking at this time at fees that are administered by other public bodies, only by state agencies.

Point made that we need to distinguish between fees and taxes. Taxes are more difficult to tap; telecommunications tax is one example of a tax that requires Framework data. There will be an effort made in the near future to increase the telecommunications tax to accommodate a variety of needs, and Framework data could be one consideration.

Point made that we have to be careful about a recommendation on redirecting funds from existing fees. We intend to create more capacity, we need to be sure we aren't causing unintended

consequences. If the premise is correct that there is a value proposition for such a redirection of funds for fee administrators, that they are already spending money on Framework data to buy it or collect it from a wide variety of sources themselves, and that we can take away that cost for them by providing the authoritative, updated data from a single central source, then we are saving them money. We would just need to ensure that we are taking no more from their fund than they are currently spending to acquire the needed Framework data themselves, while increasing the quality and completeness of the data, thereby improving the administration of their fee.

Business case and implementation plan needs to make the case for existing fees in terms of how various fees would be improved with the use of consistent, updated, statewide Framework data accessed from a central location, perhaps with some use cases to illustrate.

Public/Private Partnership (P3)

RWG thinks this is perhaps a longer term solution, but could reduce the fee requirements over time. Point made that private sector vertical markets (energy, timber, insurance, real estate, etc.) are spending large amounts of money building Framework data and we should leverage that expenditure.

Point made that public bodies supported the legislative data sharing mandate because we said we would securely share the data with other public bodies. We haven't talked much yet about how the data would be part of a P3 initiative and still be held and securely shared between public bodies. That issue needs to be resolved.

Point made that there's research to be done with the private sector vertical markets to ensure they have a need and would be customers of this approach. There is only one large public utility that is wholly within Oregon (Portland General), and point was made that the value of Oregon Framework data without data for the entire service territory of a public utility would be limited.

Similar value proposition as for existing fees, that private sector companies in the vertical markets mentioned earlier are already spending money to build or collect Framework data and would find value in having access to consistent, updated, authoritative data from a central source.

Point made that private sector in Alberta Data Partnership made a significant initial investment to stand up the effort. Point made that we need to evaluate how to set up a P3 related to data within our legal and regulatory structure. Point made that ODOT gives the data to the P3 for bridge development and road repair free of charge. The value for money analysis that will be done as part of the P3 research will help clarify the value proposition for the public sector. There's an initial investment needed to set up a P3 of this type, and the payback is long term.

Point made that we need to look at liability issue relative to P3 management of data. Does liability for incorrect data remain with the public body?

Point made that there is some overlap between the discussion we're having about a central hub for Framework data and the transparency bill also enacted in the 2017 session. Need to get some clarity around this overlap.

Next Steps

RWG will work next on the draft of the OGIC recommendation to the Legislature, to be presented to

OGIC at the October Council meeting. The final OGIC recommendation to the Legislature would then be presented for approval at the January Council meeting. RWG indicated at the meeting that they got what was needed to move forward and work on that next step, as well as continuing the research and evaluation on existing costs and expenditures.

Strategic Planning

Cy presented some slides from the Strategic Planning Work Group (SPWG), available here. The slides contain a summary of the work group's activities and the five high level Goals that the work group is considering for the Plan, as well as more detailed objectives for each of the five Goals. The primary scope of the Plan is statewide geospatial data management and coordination, with a secondary focus on geospatial Framework data management and coordination.

Mission statement proposed: "Authoritative, reliable geospatial data is available and accessible when and where needed by Oregonians." The word 'authoritative' has been somewhat controversial, but OGIC's technical and policy committees were commissioned by the Council a few years ago with preparing a document that articulated what that word means and how the Council could identify authoritative data and authoritative data sources. There's a need to have someone in government identify authoritative Framework data and authoritative sources for that data to guide the user community. Based on discussion at the April OGIC meeting and at the SPWG meeting afterward, the SPWG added the word 'reliable' to the mission statement.

Vision statement proposed: "Providing suitable access to accurate, authoritative and relevant geographic information and technology supports consistent government services across the state." Strategic Plan outline presented in the slides. It will include a summary of the work plan with responsibilities and timing, as well as outcomes (success indicators). Plan will also include business needs to be addressed and a SWOT analysis of the future state, both of which will likely be included as an appendix in order to keep the body of the Plan relatively short and more easily consumable.

The five high level goals are a. Data Sharing & Accessibility, b. Data Stewardship, c. Collaborative Governance, d. Effective Communications, and e. Sustainable Funding. Objectives for each Goal, to indicate how that goal will be accomplished, are presented in the slides linked to these minutes above. The goals will be stated in more complete language and will include one of more outcome statements for each Goal. Data stewardship includes data governance, but aspects of that objective will also likely be included under collaborative governance and data sharing & accessibility.

Point made that OGIC has a formal role in authorizing stewards for each Framework data set. It may be that OGIC will have to take a more proactive role in identifying stewards going forward. OGIC established a formal process for authorizing stewards a few years ago, but it hasn't been used. That process should probably be re-examined in the near future by the current Council. That will be on a future OGIC agenda soon.

Point made that OGIC has three standing committees identified in their Charter: Policy Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee (GPL) and Framework Implementation Team. OGIC will need to provide specific direction and guidance to each of those groups in the near future, to ensure that they are providing appropriate support to the Council. That action will also be on a future OGIC agenda soon.

Proposed listening session locations and dates are presented in the slides. Flyer with listening sessions dates and times will be pushed out broadly to ensure widest possible participation. We will

use the existing GIS lists, including Oregon URISA. Will also use OGIC members to access lists and newsletters, like AOC, LOC, OSACA, SDAO, utilities, state agency lists, and press release.

Point made that each OGIC member represents a constituency and should be communicating with those constituencies regularly in some way. Communicating with our various constituencies about the listening sessions would be really good. The draft talking points mentioned in the slides will be available soon for OGIC members to use in communicating with their constituencies, but those talking points will be honed and finalized by the end of October as a result of the listening sessions and the work to complete the draft Strategic Plan.

Point made that the term "authoritative" needs to be well understood. OGIC needs to be sure we are all on the same page about the meaning of that term. OGIC agreed a year or so ago on a process for identifying authoritative data and authoritative sources, but that process has not been used yet. Cy will add the definition to the slides on Strategic Plan and link to the white paper on the process.

Next steps: OGIC will be asked to provide feedback on the content of the Strategic Plan slides in the interim between now and the next OGIC meeting. Cy will work on draft talking points to be sent out to OGIC members for review in the next two or three weeks.

Tracking Indicators

At the April OGIC meeting, Allyson Ford and Molly Earle discussed the concept of logic models as a guide for OGIC to identify performance metrics. Allyson walked the Council through examples of everyday logic models we all use, then showed a document that describes the various components of logic models in more detail, including identification of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts related to program development.

They guided the Council through a short exercise to begin the completion of a logic model for the Council's work related to its statutory directives. Molly described the exercise and walked through the blank logic model to be used. She showed that model with one example Cy developed for this purpose. The Council divided into groups of three people and worked on the exercise for about 10 minutes, then each group reported out what they had developed. The Council established a new Tracking Indicators Work Group, which will use the results of this exercise as a starting point for their work.

Since that time, Allyson Ford has left State government and resigned from OGIC. Molly is the only person that has volunteered for the Tracking Indicators Work Group. Kay asked for volunteers, but no one volunteered at this meeting. She asked people to think it over, consider volunteering, and let her, Jeff or Cy know as soon as possible. In addition, we will check with members who were not in attendance to see if anyone would like to volunteer for this work group. We intended to initiate this work group in August or September, and to complete their work in conjunction with the other two work groups in late January.

Meeting adjourned at Noon.

Next Meeting
October 2018, TBD