

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council



Meeting Date: December 16, 2015

Time: 10:30am - Noon

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Attendees: Brady Callahan, OPRD; Randall Sounhein, DSL; Merry Seaton, DOR; Jim Rue, Chair, DLCD; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Cindy Lou McDonald, BLM; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Dennis Ruth, OMD; Malavika Bishop, DEQ; Diana Walker, ODA

Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Chair, Jim Rue at 10:30am.
- No additional agenda items were added.
- Jim talked briefly about the GEO physical move to DLCD in the Ag Building, mentioning that Cy still reports to the State CIO, that we would take at least the next year to explore, evaluate, and demonstrate a GIS shared services model, and that a longer term issue that will be explored will be the OGIC funding model and raising the stature of OGIC in Oregon govt.
- Cy announced that the GIS Framework Coordinator position at GEO has been filled by Theresa Burcsu, currently with INR at PSU and most recently playing a critical role in the development of the regional sage grouse conservation plan. She will continue to play a role in the implementation of that plan in collaboration with the Governor's office. That plan and the coalition that developed it were successful in forestalling the listing of the sage grouse under the Endangered Species Act.
- Minutes from the June 2015 and September 2015 meeting were not ready for approval. Council members expressed a desire to see those minutes as quickly as possible. It was also indicated that the March 2015 minutes had not been posted. Cy committed to getting the minutes from all three previous 2015 meetings written and posted as quickly as possible. Jim indicated that, while there has been a diminished level of administrative support for OGIC in 2015, such support will be improved in 2016 with the move of GEO to DLCD.

GPL Report – Randy Sounhein

As mentioned at the September 2015 OGIC meeting, GPL has been discussing the concept of authoritative data for some time, partly in response to the use of that term in the data sharing legislative concept endorsed by OGIC in 2014. GPL has developed a report for OGIC on authoritative data, defining the term and related terminology, and laying out some of the key issues. Randy walked through the report, pointing out some of the main ideas. The [report](#) was posted on the OGIC website prior to the meeting.

The report mentions and defines three groupings of authoritative data commonly recognized in Oregon: Framework data, rational authoritative data, and expert authoritative data. The report indicates an ongoing need for completing and maintaining the governance aspect of data management for authoritative data, particularly data not included in the Framework category.

The report was presented at the recent Framework Forum in Portland. An issue was raised there by the Lincoln County Surveyor about the use of the term authoritative data in reference to geospatial

data not developed by a land surveyor. The term 'authoritative' is used in the land surveying statute, ORS 672, to define a specific subset of geospatial data that is developed by land surveyors as the authoritative source.

Authoritative Data Governance – Cy Smith

The discussion regarding the term authoritative data continued. Cy talked further about the use of the word 'authoritative' in the discussion that resulted in revising ORS 672 in 2002-03. Dean Anderson suggested opening a discussion with the county surveyors and the Professional Land Surveyors of Oregon (PLSO). He said there is probably room for compromise on this with the surveyors, making it clear to everyone that for property boundaries and location of fixed works, as mentioned on ORS 672, surveyors are the authoritative source.

Cy talked briefly about Oregon being one of two or three states that have resolved the issues related to the professional boundary between surveying and GIS. It remains very contentious throughout the rest of the country and we want to be sure not to get into a struggle on this again with the surveyors. A key issue is to figure out how to make a clear distinction between individual tax lot boundaries as determined by a land surveyor and the tax lot inventory as compiled by the County Assessors from original survey data. Dean added that OSBEELS, the land surveying regulatory board in Oregon, should also be consulted on this in terms of making sure the use of the term authoritative data in the data sharing legislative concept is acceptable from their perspective.

Cindy Lou McDonald mentioned that she wasn't sure how the GPL report and the legislative concept accounted for the federal government's role in developing and maintaining some of the Framework data, particularly since there are differences between some federal agency depictions of Framework data from one agency to another. For example, the Census data and the BLM data for county boundaries are not identical. Cy indicated that this was one of many issues that would need to be resolved within the governance structure that OGIC will use to define the authoritative source for particular Framework data sets.

Sean McSpaden reminded the group that there are discrepancies like that between many data sets that are developed and maintained by government agencies at all levels. The governance structure will have to be used to resolve these differences. Cy reminded the group that the reason we are undertaking this effort to define authoritative data sets and the authoritative data sources for each of those data sets, is to ensure that decisions made using authoritative data will be more easily documented, that multiple organizations that make regulatory decisions will be using the same underlying authoritative data, and we will eliminate much of the duplicated data that currently persists. This is all part of better management of our collective body of data.

Cindy asked about our use of the term 'data steward', indicating that it is different than the use of that term at the federal level. Cy explained that the reason there was a difference in Oregon is that we are trying to build a model that incorporates all levels of government as part of the process. That necessitates that we have different terms for organizations that manage data at one level of government versus organizations that manage data that come from multiple levels of government.

Dave Ringeisen mentioned that ODOT has surveyors within their organization and they have some experience with managing data at one level of accuracy and precision for GIS users and another for surveyors. It should be possible to work with both types of users by referencing appropriate statutes in any proposed legislation.

Cy indicated that he would take the authoritative data report and the issues to the PAC, hoping to

have a draft governance process for dealing with authoritative data and authoritative sources to bring to the March OGIC meeting.

Data Sharing Legislative Concept – Sean McSpaden

Sean handed out a one page description of the data sharing legislative concept. The concept itself is still under development by Legislative Counsel. He mentioned that OGIC has been working on this for quite a few years without being able to get any legislative concepts introduced to the Legislature.

Sean provided a one page concept on data sharing to the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology (JLCIMT) in November. He was instructed by the Committee to work with Legislative Counsel on a legislative concept. He submitted something to Counsel that was virtually identical to the [data sharing concept endorsed by OGIC in 2014](#) and discussed by OGIC again at a couple meetings in 2015. He expects to get something back to review before the Christmas break. If it looks reasonable, he'll send it out to OGIC and others.

In January, JLCIMT will determine if they want to introduce the legislative concept in the 2016 session. Sean wanted to make sure OGIC understood that he is committed to bringing this issue up again with the JLCIMT for the 2017 session if it doesn't move forward in 2016. He said that Rep. Nathanson, the JLCIMT co-Chair, is very interested in data sharing and has been for some time. She's very passionate about good government and thinks that government agencies should not be charging each other for access to data.

He expects that the Committee will want to hear about examples from the community related to liability, confidentiality and cost issues that have traditionally come up with regard to data sharing. Sharing data between government agencies is not the same as sharing that data with the public; government agencies are all subject to the same public records laws. Cy mentioned that, under Oregon law, the custodian of data is the only one that can be compelled through a public records request to provide data to the public. Another government agency that holds that data is not subject to such a public records request.

Sean mentioned that he and Cy have met with the AOC Executive Director and his staff, and the legislative liaison for LOC on the data sharing legislative concept. Cy indicated that he and Sean would pursue a meeting on this concept with OSBEELS. Sean also mentioned that the concept included language similar to the transparency law related to no reallocation of resources or cost for agencies sharing data with each other.

Dean asked if the concept of data publication had been discussed. Sean said not with regard to this concept, but that the concept of open data has been discussed quite a bit related to the transparency law. The mechanisms for publication of shared data are in place now. In terms of the data sharing legislative concept, GEO will serve as the hub for data publication. If organizations are already publishing their Framework data, it is likely that GEO will be able to simply incorporate that data into the hub. Many rural governments that can't publish their own data will be able to take advantage of the hub concept. The administrative rule to define how the data sharing statute will work is the place to lay out these mechanisms.

Cy mentioned that the language for the data sharing legislative concept that went forward to Legislative Counsel included revisions made in 2014 to accommodate discussions with DOR on behalf of County Assessors. Sean indicated that it might be good for Jim and Cy to be available for the JLCIMT meeting in January when the legislative concept is addressed. Jim indicated that he

would like to see Sean participate in OGIC regularly in the future.

OGIC Executive Order Revision – Jim Rue

Jim indicated that the [EO](#) is ready to go forward to the Governor's Office. Cy wrote a short document for use with the Governor's office about why the EO needs to be revised and has submitted that to Jim and Alex. Jim said he hopes Alex will take the EO to the Governor in January. He and Alex will discuss further in the next day or so and determine how to proceed. Once the EO is in place, OGIC can begin work on a Charter.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45am.

Next meeting:

March 16, 2015

10:30am - Noon

155 Cottage St. Conf. Room A

DRAFT