

# RECAP

## Oregon Geographic Information Council

**Meeting Date:** October 25, 2019

**Time:** 10:00am – 2:00pm

**Location:** 155 Capitol St. NE, Conference Room A, Salem

**Member Attendees:** Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept. (Vice Chair); Renee Davis, OWEB; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Dave Stuckey, OMD; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Steven Hoffert, OYA; Rep. Mike Nearman; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications; Lisa Gaines, OSU INR; Patrick Gronli, PGE

**Staff/Observers:** Phil McClellan, DOR; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Kathryn Helms, OSCIO-Chief Data Officer; John Stroud, RDI; Brett Juul, ODOT; Thom York, DOR; Randall Sounhein, DSL; Mary French, DSL; Nikki Hart-Brinkley, Rogue Valley COG; Cy Smith, GEO; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Terri Morganson, Esri

### Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Chair Jeff Frkonja at 10:00am. With 15 of the 18 voting [OGIC members](#) present, a quorum was established for conducting business and taking votes.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- No additions to the [agenda](#) were made. No announcements made.
- [Minutes](#) from the July meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

### Chief Data Officer Role and Responsibilities

Kathryn presented [these slides](#) and provided some comments related to the slides as follows:

- Spoke to the Data Utility portion of the State CDO's mission
- Data governance is "managing data with guidance"
- The crux of the data governance and management mandate (ORS 276A.350-374) is mandating that all agencies create an enterprise data inventory
- Important for agencies to recognize that data are a state asset and should be managed as such
- Statute calls for an MOU on data sharing to be established, primarily interagency data sharing, but some local governments and non-profits have expressed interest in being included
- Drew a lot of inspiration for data stewardship concepts from OGIC Framework program
- Enterprise Data and Information Strategy will be modeled after Federal Information Strategy

She answered a few questions, as follows:

Question around funding for CDO, Kathryn pointed back to slide on Policy Option Package (POP) with resources for both GEOHub and Open Data Portal for 2021-2 biennium.

Question about geospatial data sets being considered for open data portal, Kathryn mentioned tabular data available from data.oregon.gov and geospatial data available from Esri, such as American Community Survey, that can be used to query, index and aggregate other available data sets. She went on to say that she is waiting to see what data sets the geospatial community thinks would be important to share. She mentioned wildfire mitigation as being an example of a business process that might be useful as a way of identifying needed shareable data sets.

Question about whether open data means crowd sourced data, she said no, it means data that is shared openly for all to access.

Question about relationship between enterprise data sharing and security/privacy and what that relationship will look like going forward, she said she is hoping for a decision tree kind of approach where the community decides what is most useful and what should be made available, versus what should be securely accessed, and what avenue should be appropriately used for publication. That would involve the development of a more structured and useful approach than simply making raw data available in the simplest format. This also requires relationship building to let the community know what is available and ensure it is continuing to be useful. Envisioning a single landing page with federated sources so the user can get to the data easier without going to multiple sites.

Question about the intention or plan for bringing local government into the mix, Kathryn mentioned that some locals already have open data portals, and that she is testing some models now but is open to feedback on how to proceed.

Dean mentioned that dealing with need for continuous access to portal for critical business needs is more crucial for rural local governments than is the need to support application development.

### **Resource Work Group Recommendation**

Jeff presented some thoughts to provide context for [these slides](#).

- Way recommendation was presented in last legislative session wasn't compelling enough to some legislators
- Need to point out value of results to real people, which will then engage those people to advocate for recommendation
- Reorganized Resource Work Group into two teams, Recommendation Team and Engagement Team
- Need to be more sophisticated about how to package budget proposal so that it is included in the Executive branch budget process

Engagement Team identified five business needs for consideration by the Recommendation Team, as laid out in the slides, and identified potential stakeholders. There would be a project conducted around each of these business needs to validate GEOHub functionality and other aspects of the data sharing program, and ensure stakeholder support. It is likely that two or three projects is all that would be funded in the 2021-23 biennium.

The Recommendation Team has been working on a business plan for OGIC activities, and a POP budget proposal. Steven walked through the basic elements and timeline of the business plan from the slides referenced earlier, which will be completed by July 2020. POP must be authored by end of November 2019. OGIC said they would like to see a draft of the business plan for review prior to the January OGIC meeting.

The POP should be driven by the business plan, but the timing makes that difficult. The business plan is, however, under development, so some thinking has been done on the business plan that can inform the POP. OGIC will also see the draft POP for review prior to the January OGIC meeting. The initial draft POP will undergo a first review and prioritization by the DAS Executive Team the first week of December. If the POP moves forward from there, there will likely be an opportunity for further refinement in January and beyond, and to include a solid business case to accompany the POP.

Kay indicated that the reason DAS starts the POP review and approval process is that DAS is primarily funded by assessments from all other state agencies, so DAS needs to complete its budget work in order to allow agencies to complete their budget work. She also said it is more likely to be included in the budget if the POP is more carefully put together and refined.

Steven explained a bit about the Stage Gate IT project oversight process, which is based on the Project Management Body of Knowledge. OSCIO has adopted that oversight process and it's possible that the OGIC POP will need to go through the Stage Gate process. That will involve a business case to justify this IT project, which will then accompany the POP as it moves forward. The business case would then be reviewed by an IT analyst in OSCIO, then it would move forward to an executive team composed of agency directors that review IT projects and provide feedback to help the budget folks in the Governor's office understand if project is ready, has strong sponsorship, is resourced properly, etc.

Kathryn indicated that the combined POP will be for data intake and publication, but the CDO needs are minimal, most of the POP will be for the OGIC data sharing program needs.

Jeff restated the criteria for making selection(s) of the validation/evaluation projects based on the five business processes identified earlier. Patrick mentioned the importance of tax lots for electric utilities, saying that PGE maintains their own land base, as do most other public utilities, because they can't get a statewide tax lot database from local governments or the state. He said that utilities could better identify where more customers could be served and better served if they had a common land base, as well as better identify where underground utilities are located and co-

located, where utilities need to be turned off during an emergency situation, etc. Cy mentioned that public utilities in some parts of Oregon have divided up their territories in areas where they will shut off power during wildfire events. Local governments will have to know where vulnerable populations and critical infrastructure and facilities are located in relationship to those areas. In addition, utilities would need to notify people before power shut outages. Patrick indicated they need access to the ORMAP statewide tax lot data, but they need it to be improved, accurate, and consistent from county to county.

Dave Stuckey said we should be cautious about pinning too much of our strategy on public safety, perhaps diversifying into social services, education, jobs, etc. Kay said we should be more concerned about public good, government purposes, etc., and less about stakeholder engagement. Patti suggested we could broaden the stakeholder engagement around public safety to include the public utilities, social service agencies, schools, and other communities that aren't traditionally seen as part of the public safety community. John Waffenschmidt said he thought we would be fine going forward with a tsunami project, but that we should broaden it to be an earthquake project, which would have better support from more stakeholders. Patti mentioned again that our proposal would have to address questions from the metro areas, where data is already shared fairly well, about the value proposition for them. Jeff asked if there were other ideas for validation projects, none were offered.

Kay mentioned that the state government executive team that will be evaluating IT projects will be focused on the broad enterprise value of each proposed project, and will be looking for return on investment, not just in a financial sense, but also in terms of the overall value proposition. Kathryn said we should look at alignment with the Governor's priorities and look for opportunities for multi-organizational collaboration. One of the Governor's key priorities is equity across the state, which is in alignment with our primary value proposition, consistent provision of government services through consistent access to authoritative statewide data. Cy provided an example from the DHS emergency manager who was in Josephine County during a recent winter storm. The Josephine County emergency manager needed to evacuate residents of a nursing home where the power was out, but didn't have the data to know where to take them, nor where all the other vulnerable populations were located in relationship to the power outage.

John W. provided an example of a transportation package passed in the last Legislative session, and how a larger percentage of the financial burden was carried by the urban areas so that enough funds could be provided to the rural areas to improve the roads in those areas. Kay said we just need to be clear about funding allocations to rural areas if that's the direction we decide to go, and Patti agreed that we just need to have our talking points well defined. Dean said we need to clearly understand how we would scale the validation projects, so that we don't just end up with some fancy proofs of concept.

Next step will be to provide OGIC members with an opportunity to make an email decision on which of the five validation projects they want to move forward with. The RWG will have to move forward with making choices about the project ideas in order to get something to Kathryn to include in the combined POP, but OGIC will have an opportunity in late November or early December to see those choices and vote to approve or disapprove, as well as provide feedback. That OGIC decision by email will then need to be ratified at the next meeting in late January. The message sent to OGIC about the projects will also ask for feedback on stakeholders that haven't yet been identified.

Dean said we should engage the elections officials on the taxing district boundaries, since the taxing districts have to be aligned with precinct boundaries. County Clerks are the stakeholders in that case, as well as League of Women Voters. Lisa mentioned that we should engage more broadly with the community of folks that are involved in gathering data related to wildfire risk. Kay mentioned that the community of folks involved with workforce development is very broad and may

not see the value of geospatial data right now. Such data would definitely help those stakeholders, but she wasn't sure if they would be helpful to our cause.

### **Performance Measures Update**

Molly provided an overview of work being done by Theresa on behalf of the Performance Indicators work group on a [navigatOR Strategic Plan Dashboard](#). This is a draft, but displays the basic form the dashboard will likely take. It is currently pre-populated with the OGIC Objectives and Key Results agreed upon at the last OGIC meeting. The progress being made on the OKRs will be added to the dashboard prior to the January meeting. The work on the dashboard is being conducted in an online spreadsheet that all of the people assigned to the various key results can access and update. Cy walked the group through the current status of the key results for each OGIC Objective. The document showing those results is [here](#). There will be an hour on the January agenda to review progress and decide on continuing some key results and defining new key results.

### **Framework Implementation Team Charter**

Theresa walked the group through the revised Framework Implementation Team Charter, as proposed by OGIC members at the last meeting. The revised charter was posted [here](#) for OGIC review prior to the meeting. Council voted unanimously to approve the revised FIT Charter.

### **GPL Structure and Recommendation**

Cy walked the group through a recommendation from the GIS Program Leaders group related to its structure. The document encapsulating that recommendation is [here](#). GPL has been a state agency group since its inception and wants to stay that way. Point made that there are technical issues that require local government representation. As such GPL came up with three alternatives, and made a specific recommendation in the referenced document related to the formation of a technical advisory group for OGIC.

There were several questions and some discussion about the recommendation from Council members. Some of the questions were about the relationship between GPL and the OGIC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in the recommendation. It was agreed that OGIC should take advantage of the expertise in the current GPL group, if possible. The recommendation made by GPL represents a compromise position. Point was made that there is quite a bit of overlap between GPL and the various FIT teams. Kay asked for an overall graphic of the organizational structure as proposed. Perhaps there would be a dashed line representing the relationship between OGIC's TAC and the GPL.

There is a technical issue that requires attention now: OGIC's role in providing advice for implementation of the new NGS datum in 2022. The first round of feedback is required in early 2020, before the TAC can be established. In addition, point was made that it would be very good to have a technical advisory committee for OGIC to provide advice on the development of GEOHub going forward. It seems likely that there are local government and private sector folks that would be available for a TAC. GPL recommendation as presented in the referenced document approved unanimously.

### **State Plane Coordinate System Revisions**

[The State Plane Coordinate System, 2022](#) revision to be established by the National Geodetic Survey, is moving through a process to gain endorsement by States. OGIC's recommendation on this new coordinate system is sought by the State committee that is responsible for making the endorsement to NGS. The final design for the new system is due to be completed by March 31, 2021, so this will be ongoing work for the Council. Right now, the initial recommendation from the Council is due in February, so there is a need for some technical work to be done to prepare a recommendation for the

Council to review at its January meeting. GPL is willing to prepare the recommendation if the Council agrees. After that, the OGIC TAC would pick up the work going forward. The Council approved having GPL work with the coordinate reference system committee to put together a recommendation for OGIC to review on the new coordinate system at its March meeting.

### **Policy Advisory Committee**

Dean Anderson presented the slides linked [here](#) related to the establishment of an OGIC Policy Advisory Committee. Primary point of the slides is that OGIC should form policy advisory committees for each Framework data theme, comparable to the Framework Implementation Teams that provide technical advice to OGIC about each Framework theme. Such policy advisory committees are contemplated in the OGIC statute. This approach has worked well for the cadastral (tax lots) theme over the last 20 years. It might not be necessary right now to establish PACs for every theme, but there are a half dozen or so that could be good candidates for this approach. There was some discussion about how to organize the committees in some other way that would avoid setting up a separate PAC for every Framework theme. The Council indicated that more work should be done to put together a coherent plan for implementing the PAC concept. Question raised about the relationship of the PACs to OGIC and to the existing FIT technical teams. PACs should be providing advice to OGIC on Framework policy issues. Dean, Brandt Melick, and Thom York will work with Cy and Theresa to further refine the concept. Others are welcome to join, and OGIC members are encouraged to look for others in their organizations that could provide input.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

**Next Meeting** - January 2020, TBD