

# RECAP

## Oregon Geographic Information Council

**Meeting Date:** January 30, 2019

**Time:** 10:00am – 1:00pm

**Location:** 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A, Salem

**Member Attendees:** Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Cy Smith, GEO; Tom Rohlifing, Marion County Assessor; Lisa Gaines, OSU-INR; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Steven Hoffert, OYA; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Renee Davis, OWEB; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Patrick Gronli, Portland General Electric; Dave Stuckey, Oregon Military Dept.; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept. (Vice Chair); Dean Anderson, Polk County IT Manager

**Staff/Observers:** Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Randall Sounhein, DSL; Rachel Smith, DLCD; Brett Juul, ODOT; John Stroud, RDI; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Terri Morganson, Esri; John Prychun, DOR; Kathryn Helms, OSCIO-Chief Data Officer; Randy Dana, DLCD; Nikki Hart-Brinkley, RVCOG

### Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Jeff Frkonja, Chair, at 10:00am. With 15 of the 20 voting [OGIC members](#) present, a quorum was established for conducting business.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- Additions to the [agenda](#) were made to add an item related to Framework Team leads endorsement. No announcements made.
- [Minutes](#) from the October meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

### Legislative Recommendation – Jeff

Jeff and Cy walked the group through a slide deck, available [here](#), on the Legislative Recommendation [document](#). They did a fast walkthrough because most of the material has been presented before to the Council. Cy summarized the outreach to Legislators just prior to the slide walkthrough:

- Jeff, Kay &/or Cy have spoken with a number of legislators, **as their individual schedules allowed**, including Rep. Greg Smith, Rep. Marsh, Sen. Johnson, Sen. Manning, Rep. Clem's Chief of Staff, Rep. Nathanson, Sen. Roblan, Rep. Nearman, Sen. Steiner-Hayward, Sen. Riley.
- All are supportive of statewide Framework data development and understand its value
- Federated business model for Framework development and management is widely supported
- Funding recommendation isn't in Governor's budget, but legislators didn't see that as a concern
- Tapping fees as a funding mechanism is generally supported, but not an option to tap all or most
- Debt financing is somewhat supported, reaction mixed, including some support for General Fund
- Public/private partnership (P3) concept generally supported

There were some questions that came out of the outreach meetings with legislators, which can be summarized as follows:

- Why should the state be responsible for paying for this when many local governments refuse to pay for it or prioritize it themselves?
- Who will be the authority here, ensuring public bodies share data with each other?

- What does the state get for \$18m? Why will this be any different than other failed IT projects the state has pursued?
- What fees are we proposing to tap? Won't we be simply increasing the cost of permits, etc.?
- What would we do with less money than we are requesting?

Jeff mentioned that we will update our talking points to address these questions to the extent possible. He also mentioned that the basic premise in response to the question about why the state should pay for this is that local governments are already investing quite a bit of money and resources into developing and maintaining geospatial Framework data, but a resource gap exists that they can't fill by themselves. Cy mentioned that the P3 issue was raised with some legislators and they were supportive of it, but there was a question from Rep. Nathanson about how the data would be handled vis a vis public domain.

Following the rapid walk through of the slides, there were several questions and comments:

- Will the benefits begin prior to completion of all Framework data? *Yes; although we haven't done an ROI study of this proposal, such a study was conducted of the precursor to this proposal in 2007, with a similar data development approach, and ROI started in years 3 and 4. The intent of the evaluation projects in this proposal is to begin to see benefits within the first two years. We need to change the slide that indicates we can develop the data in 10 years rather than 30.*
- If we're spending \$5B on geospatial data now, why can't we find \$18M for this proposal?
- Should we characterize this as an IT project, when nearly all the work will be data collection? We should emphasize that this is about improving government service across the state, and that IT is an essential way of doing that.
- Start with slide on who/what is OGIC, who are the members; provide the context slides that are now 9-11 to the front, then go to examples, then move to the ask.
- Have a graphic that lays out the timeline and expenditures for the \$18M ask, including decision points, giving the Legislature the ability to provide part of the funding now and the rest during the next short session, or provide the appropriation but only part of the limitation with checkpoints to get more limitation, etc. That lets the Legislature line up the expenditure with deliverables.
- Have we heard from OSCIO that we need to proceed in a certain way with regard to Stagegate? *No, we are pursuing the full \$18M program as a portfolio of projects through Stagegate, with the first one being GEOHub. We are attempting to get to Stagegate 1 endorsement for the full portfolio prior to the March 14 JLCIMT meeting. We are also compiling a list of successful projects we've pursued and completed to show we know what we're doing. The point is to show JLCIMT we are capable of implementing this program successfully.*
- The gap to be closed isn't about local government lacking what they need for their specific purposes. The gap is about developing consistency of data and resources statewide so services can be offered consistently statewide.
- We need to show data sets in the slides that state agencies are responsible for and that are incomplete, not just data sets that locals are responsible for and that are incomplete.
- Need to be clear in describing how we will spend \$18M in one biennium, including hiring, contracting, etc. Need to be aware that even if we have funding, if we are asking local governments to do something and they are willing to do it, it will take them time. *We have primarily looked at how much we need to do the work, not as much at how we would spend the funds. We are counting on being able to start planning, initiating procurement activities, advertising positions, etc. before the beginning of the biennium, before funding is available. We would have to look at moving people into the three FTE positions from within state government. If we can do that preliminary work prior to the funding cycle beginning, we should be able to spend the full \$18m in the biennium. We also have to be aware that we need to know what we*

*need in the next budget cycle, 2021-23, within a 12-14 month timeframe to get in the Governor's budget. Some of the work in the \$18m ask is needed to prepare for the next budget cycle.*

- Need to rethink what we're saying about the address point slide where we're saying that missing addresses create a public safety problem and first responders can't respond, and that we need to fix that. We should be emphasizing that fixing that problem is a function of multiple local government organizations working together, and that completing the address points solves a number of issues, including public safety and e-permitting.
- We should carefully consider how much time it will take to validate and approve data developed for the evaluation projects in the first biennium; this frequently takes more time than expected.
- The evaluation projects are the place where we will get local involvement and buy in, so we need to be careful about how those are scoped and implemented. Need to involve locals in pre-planning for evaluation projects to ensure they are onboard and understand requirements.
- Need a few examples that show ROI for state government to provide to legislators; example given of ease of integrating roads by ODOT if locals are able to provide standardized data more consistently.

Question asked as to which specific fees we were considering for the funding approach. The fees that have been identified as possibilities for the 2019-21 biennium right now are building permits, telecommunications tax (911), universal service fund (broadband), public utilities annual fee, vehicle registration fees, wastewater/solid waste disposal fee, and boat registrations. There are about 4,400 fees administered by state agencies and they generate about \$3.2B/biennium. The fee administrators have not been approached about support at this time. There are bills in this session to raise the fees for broadband and 911.

Fees would be used to pay for debt service and data maintenance, so they would be an ongoing sustainable funding source. In the first biennium, fees would be tapped to provide \$6m for the 2019-21 biennium (\$3m/yr), and would be increased over time so that they would provide \$12m for the 2021-23 biennium, \$18m for the 2023-25 biennium, and \$26m for the 2025-27 biennium and future biennia (\$13m/yr).

Our proposal would have to include raising fees, not taking money from existing fee administrators. Point made that if the Legislature mandated a fee increase for this purpose, it would be easier for the fee administrators to accept and support. **Point made that the fee revenue in the current proposal is only for debt service for \$16million of the \$18million in the first biennium. The fee revenue enables but is not directly part of the first \$18m ask; fee revenue will eventually directly fund some of the program operations.** Point made that one of the evaluation projects should be scoped to provide value for building permits. We will need to at least let the specific fee administrators know about our proposal before the JLCIMT meeting in mid-March. Point made that we should consider narrowing the number of fees we are proposing to tap even further to bring down the number of fee administrators to be engaged.

Point made that we should point out to the Legislature that, even if we aren't successful with our future funding requests, the 2019-21 funding request and the work to be accomplished will provide value. We should make clear what that value will be.

Jeff summarized by saying that it was his understanding that OGIC approved of the 2019-21 proposal to the Legislature, including the scope of the proposal and the funding approach, with the caveat that Cy needs to provide a two year spend plan that lays out a realistic timeframe for the elements of the proposal. The Council agreed.

## Strategic Planning

Cy talked through a summary of the [draft Strategic Plan](#) and the five high level Goals, proposed outcomes for each of the five goals, as well as more detailed proposed objectives for each of the five Goals. He specifically thanked Lisa Gaines for her help in restructuring the Plan to be more clear and succinct. 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: "Authoritative, reliable geospatial data is available and accessible when and where needed by Oregonians."

Vision statement: "Providing suitable access to accurate, authoritative and relevant geographic information and technology supports consistent government services across the state."

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 included in the Plan. Placeholder metrics are included for each outcome in the Plan, to be validated and/or replaced by the Performance Metrics when they meet in the next few weeks.

Point made that governance is very important and we should consider making it the first goal. Suggestion made to not number the goals and indicate they are not prioritized. Suggestion made that there are needs for different levels of data completeness depending on the business need in various parts of the state and the Plan should reflect that. Cy will work with the Strategic Planning Work Group to make that point in the Plan more clearly.

Strategic Plan adopted by Council, contingent on change suggested in previous paragraph about regional data differences. Outcomes could be wordsmithed a bit, for example the first one could be "decision making will be supported by improved data", something more descriptive of outcomes. Work group will make some changes as suggested, send to Council and if no objections are noted, Plan will be considered adopted. If there are objections later, the Council will have to reconvene to address any changes.

## Charter Adoption

The [OGIC Charter](#) was adopted as revised to include a provision to remove the Chair if needed.

## Outreach Planning & Execution

Jeff pointed out need to mobilize various OGIC constituencies to communicate and build support for the OGIC legislative proposal. Cy mentioned that he and Brandt Melick met with staff at LOC to brief them on the proposal. He and Kay met with officials at the Treasury Dept. to talk about debt financing and what was possible. He met with the OLCC Director to talk about the Framework data they would need for their programs. He met with a group of drinking water organizations from a number of special districts recently and they were very supportive of the proposal. He met the County Assessors, Cartographers, and County Treasurers at the OSACA Conference recently. And he was meeting with a regional government group organized by LCOG in Eugene right after the OGIC meeting.

Jeff asked each non-State agency member to briefly say what they could do to communicate and build support with their constituency. Jeff indicated that we have several communications devices that we will provide to everyone, including: 1) talking points document; 2) one page chart to

summarize the proposal; 3) slide show presented in this meeting; 4) longer document that lays out the full proposal.

Jeff will continue reaching out to each of the COGs, as he has been doing. Dean will inform the Oregon URISA group, speaking at a meeting in Bend of their members and later in April at their conference. He will send an open letter to their membership, but needs to know what we want them to do. We need to ask them to communicate with their individual legislators to indicate their support. When we know the specific legislation that will contain the funding proposal, we can let them know. Cy will draft a support letter template that can be sent to groups like this. Several groups have already indicated a willingness to send such a letter to legislators or committees.

Carrie has been communicating with the SDAO Executive Director, but to get this on their radar we need to send something specifically asking for support. The SDAO conference is taking place in Sun River Feb. 7-10. Carrie will send an email to the SDAO ED to ask if there could be a way for Cy to speak with folks there, as he will be in Bend for the Oregon URISA meeting on Feb. 8. Cy will enlist Colleen to help with the SDAO communication in Sun River.

Molly will communicate with her clients to see if she can get support for some of them and to get them to help communicate with their peers and other colleagues. She can make use of the talking points and other materials for this purpose.

Tom will continue to work with OSACA to build support. A letter of support from OSACA based on the template Cy will provide would be very helpful. Dean indicated that he and John had talked and that John was ready to take the OGIC-approved proposal to AOC leadership to get endorsement. Cy mentioned that AOC provided a letter of support for the Legislature for the 2009 funding proposal that OGIC made. Tom mentioned that having AOC endorsement would be a really good thing from OSACA's perspective, since they are an affiliate of AOC. Tom also mentioned that the Sheriff's Association could be a good contact and supporter. The Marion County Sheriff is leaving his position and will take over soon as the ED for the Sheriff's Association. Tom will connect Cy with that person.

Brandt reiterated that he and Cy met with LOC staff, specifically Erin Doyle who was part of the stakeholder group that worked on the 2017 data sharing legislation. She asked for some additional materials to help her make the case to her leadership. He suggested getting some municipal folks together in his area to discuss this, and the materials we discussed earlier would be helpful. Jeff suggested that the COGs could help bring some municipal folks together for this purpose and Brandt thought that was a good idea. Brandt will check with LOC staff to see if there are meetings in the near future where a briefing could be provided. He also mentioned that the City of Springfield has some resources now that they are using for promoting political initiatives and he will ask them for some advice. Cy and Brandt will work with Erin to get some communication with LOC Executive Director and legislative liaison.

Colleen indicated that she is unaware of any comprehensive list of local GIS folks that could be used to communicate statewide about this proposal. She could use some guidance from LOC and others about how to get the word out to affected folks at the local government level. Cy suggested that he, Colleen and Brandt should coordinate on this. Cy mentioned that most of the folks that attended the Strategic Plan listening sessions were local GIS folks, they were all very supportive and they need help and guidance to communicate to their leadership. We need to provide that help and guidance in the form of communication tools.

Lisa and Cy talked in this meeting about the potential to involve leadership at OSU. Cy mentioned that perhaps Cindy Sager's replacement might be a place to start. Lisa said the interim VP that replaced Cindy might be helpful and she would ask her about it. Cy reminded the group that Eastern Oregon University had expressed an interest in being a regional aggregator.

Patrick will be working with the public utilities, especially in the Portland area, to quiet their fears that this initiative will be trying to take their data and make it public. After we get past that fear, we can communicate with the utilities about how the data we'll be collecting could be useful for them, and how a partnership with the public utilities could benefit public bodies and public utilities, even though the utilities aren't mandated to share their data. We need to communicate the level of quality and completeness of the Framework data and how that compares to data they might purchase elsewhere. They have a conference in Portland soon, so there could be a communication opportunity.

We will contact Patti to find out what she can do to communicate and build support from PSAPs.

Kay talked about the need to communicate with OSCIO as soon as possible, especially with the new Chief Data Officer. Briefing state agency directors can happen through the Enterprise Leadership Team. She can work with Katy Coba and Terrence Woods to get on their agenda. She is also part of the Enterprise IT Group that reviews all state IT projects and provide advice and guidance to OSCIO, so a conversation is necessary there. She mentioned that the Oregon Workforce Partnership **might** be a good group to supply a letter of support, especially since Cy has been working with them on a proof of concept to support their needs with Framework data and GIS tools. She also mentioned that the Regional Solutions Teams that are chartered by the Governor's office **might** be a good group to approach about a support letter. And she mentioned that the Coastal Caucus in the Legislature might be a good champion for this proposal. Senators Roblan and Johnson, and Rep. Brock Smith are leaders there.

Dave indicated that we need to connect directly with Patti on the potential to get support for using a portion of the proposed increase in the telecommunications tax for the purposes of this proposal. He mentioned that there is an emergency manager's conference coming up in Bend in April and that would be a good opportunity to communicate with emergency managers. Cy mentioned the disaster assessment proof of concept GEO has been working on with 6 county emergency managers and they are willing to send a letter of support.

Renee mentioned that we should ask the Governor's Natural Resource Cabinet for support, but will need to wait until the Governor's budget has been dealt with by the Legislature.

Brett Juul mentioned that it would be good to communicate more with the OAGITM group of local and state agency IT directors. They have a meeting coming up soon. Steven indicated that he would bring this up with them at their roundtable discussion.

Jeff indicated that we'll put this detail into a more structured plan and present back to OGIC as soon as possible. He key to success is to have a plan so everyone knows what we're doing, what their role is, and that we're all on the same page with the same message.

### **Framework Implementation Team**

Theresa presented the names of four new leads for Framework Implementation Teams:

- Hazards FIT – Nancy Calhoun, DOGAMI
- Geosciences FIT – David Percy, PSU
- Administrative Boundaries FIT – Robert Mansolillo, DLCD
- Address Points FIT – Thomas Elder, DHS

All four were approved by the Council

Meeting adjourned at 12:53pm.

**Next Meeting**  
April 2019, TBD

DRAFT