

# RECAP

## Oregon Geographic Information Council

**Meeting Date:** June 15, 2016

**Time:** 10:30am - Noon

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

**Attendees:** Jim Rue, Chair, DLCD; Cy Smith, GEO; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Eric Hiebenthal, BLM

### Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Chair, Jim Rue at 10:30am.
- Minutes from March meeting were available but had not been reviewed, deferred to next meeting.
- Jim Rue made an announcement regarding the GIS shared services approach. He talked about an interactive application to map the Oregon economy that DLCD, OBDD, ODOT, Employment and PSU have begun conceptualizing.
- Cy mentioned the NW GIS User Group meeting coming in mid-October in Salem. He also mentioned the Esri UC in San Diego, to which at least a half dozen will attend, and the Open Street Map conference in Seattle at the end of July.
- Brady Callahan asked to have the Framework prioritization added to the agenda.

### GPL Report – Randy Sounhein

Randy provided the following GPL report:

GIS shared services is now a standing agenda item on the GPL agenda. At the last meeting, Josh Tanner with GEO proposed starting a new subcommittee to focus on web mapping and web applications. It will be called the Oregon Web Geographers group and will be a forum for sharing and discussing code.

GPL also talked about establishing an inventory of GIS projects that agencies are working on, a project portfolio that will help agencies collaborate more effectively. Cy mentioned that GEO had very recently gotten access to the OSCIO Project Portfolio Management tool, but haven't yet had time to explore it. It is not quite ready for production use, but could be an appropriate tool for capturing an inventory of state GIS projects.

GPL also discussed enterprise procurement for GIS services. Dave Ringeisen mentioned that ODOT had started exploring ways to use their GIS services agreement for other agencies' projects, but thus far hadn't been able to figure out a way to do that. Cy said he would follow up with DAS Procurement to see if they could help. This could be a way to provide staff augmentation or additional expertise for shared services projects. Sean mentioned that it could also be beneficial for local governments.

Brady Callahan brought up phodar at the GPL meeting and provided a demo. It could be a good substitute for Lidar where we may not ever be able to get Lidar in some parts of the state. Jim asked

Brady to provide a phodar presentation at a future OGIC meeting.

Randy also mentioned that Esri has started providing a lot of free training and informational webinars available to us as a result of our Enterprise License Agreement.

### **Shared Services Approach/Activities – Cy Smith**

A group of about 30 agency representatives, including many GIS staff and other IT staff, met recently to discuss the definition of GIS shared services and the approach we might consider taking together to pursue projects collaboratively. We talked about accessing higher level GIS knowledge that exists in various state agencies, knowledge that is not generally available for projects that might benefit multiple agencies or the entire enterprise of state government. We talked about the need to backfill the time spent on shared services projects by GIS staff with specialized skills and knowledge. The higher level staff are typically doing a mix of higher level and lower level work. The lower level work could potentially be backfilled.

The result of the meeting was to establish a small work group that would define some projects we could do as prototypes or proofs of concept for shared services. Those projects could demonstrate over the next three months what we could do together in a shared services environment. The small work group met and came up with three prototype projects: Collecting energy and water facilities data from local governments and making it available for state agencies; developing a web map to display the status of lead testing in schools; developing a web application to map the Oregon economy in a way that enables decision makers to prioritize state investments.

The group will define those three projects more completely soon, with the objective of completing them by mid-September. There is the potential of making a budget request to support pursuing these projects and the shared services approach. Part of the shared services approach would be to establish a governance structure, probably under OGIC, that would enable agencies to collaboratively define projects to be done, identify resources to complete the projects, etc. Some shared services projects would benefit the enterprise, some would benefit a group of agencies, and some would primarily benefit a single agency with results that could be used as a template to create applications that would then benefit multiple agencies or the enterprise.

Jim mentioned that the Cascadia exercise showed the need for data and applications developed by multiple agencies that could be easily brought to bear on a single problem or issue that affected the enterprise. RAPTOR, the first responder situational awareness tool that OEM, GEO, and Multnomah County developed in 2010 was a key element of the Cascadia exercise. OEM has now taken ownership of RAPTOR. It uses a lot of Framework data and its use in the Cascadia event shows one of the many benefits of a shared services approach. PrepFIT has added tremendous value to the RAPTOR application through their multi-agency, shared services approach to developing a catalogue of data critical to emergency response and making it available securely through RAPTOR.

### **Data Sharing Legislative Concept – Sean McSpaden**

JLCIMT/ State CIO co-sponsored [Geospatial Data Sharing Work Group](#), formed to study barriers and challenges to data sharing between public bodies and develop a data sharing legislative concept for consideration in the 2017 Legislative Session, has been meeting regularly since April 8. Sean presented the efforts of the Work Group and the sub-group that has been meeting more often to prepare work products for the Work Group to review and evaluate. The Work Group will be meeting on June 20 and will take up three work products from the sub-group, including a [pilot project description](#), a [legislative concept summary document](#), and a set of [presentation slides](#).

Cy showed the [website](#) that the Work Group uses to post its work products, presentations, etc. Cy mentioned that the Work Group heard at their May meeting from Polk County and Marion County about tax lot data production, DOR about tax lot data processing to make it part of a statewide Framework data set, and OWRD about use of tax lot data with water rights data. Sean mentioned that we heard about transportation Framework data production and use at the first Work Group meeting on April 8. At the next Work Group meeting, the group will hear about emergency preparedness Framework data. At the meeting after that, the group will hear about administrative boundaries Framework data.

Cy and Sean have started doing outreach on the Work Group activities, including meeting with the Regional Solutions Team, the Executive Director of the Special Districts Association, and others. They are working now to get on the agenda for an upcoming Natural Resources Cabinet meeting. Sean will be speaking to the State CIO Council and Sean and Cy are on the agenda for an upcoming meeting of the Oregon Association of Government IT Managers in Bend.

Sean indicated that one of the key issues that has come out of the Work Group and sub-group discussions has been cost recovery related to fees charged by public bodies to each other for sharing geospatial data. The sub-group has been discussing possible cost models to account for this issue. The JLCIMT has trouble understanding the need for public bodies to charge each other for exchange of public data. However, eliminating those fees will create a budget hole for some jurisdictions. Those fees don't usually go to the GIS programs, but rather to the jurisdiction's general fund. This issue is the primary issue that hasn't yet been resolved at the sub-group level.

Another issue that has gotten a lot of discussion by the Work Group and sub-group has been the use of intergovernmental agreements to resolve data sharing issues. Sean and Cy have been asked to meet soon with one of the County attorneys for Multnomah County that is representing a number of other counties, as well, to discuss issues they have with the latest version of the data sharing agreement for tax lot data. The use of intergovernmental agreements to govern data sharing between 1200+ jurisdictions presents significant challenges.

Governance of data sharing is another issue that has come up with the Work Group; how, when, and what will be shared. The Work Group has specifically requested that the legislative concept include a governance structure like OGIC for data sharing purposes. They were uncomfortable with the State CIO being the single decider for data sharing issues. They have said OGIC needs to be restructured to be more representative of all the stakeholders in order to manage the data sharing issues. Sean presented the potential membership of a restructured OGIC, which follows the basic structure of the State Interoperability Executive Council.

The restructured OGIC would be administratively placed within the Office of the State CIO, and GEO and the State GIO position would provide support to the Council as they do now. OGIC would be granted administrative rule-making authority and authority to develop and maintain the GIS Strategic Plan. The duties, roles and responsibilities for OGIC will closely follow the language from the updated Executive Order that OGIC agreed upon a few months ago. The concept will also identify at a high level the Framework data concept and the Framework Implementation Team structure. The concept will include an OGIC fund or account to capture any available moneys, and a mandate to share geospatial Framework data between public bodies through a central clearinghouse. The Work Group is mindful of not overloading the legislative concept with a large fiscal impact.

Legislative Counsel will need to be consulted on the concept of data custodian, which is central to the data sharing legislative concept. The data custodian exists in Oregon statute (ORS 192.410)

and should enable public bodies that share data with other public bodies to maintain control of the shared data. That means that a public body that receives data from a data custodian, which is another public body, cannot be compelled to provide that data based on a public records request. Instead, the requestor would be pointed back to the data custodian. Sean will report back to OGIC on the activities of the Work Group at the September meeting. Meanwhile, activities and progress will be posted to the Group's website. There will be a report to the JLCIMT on September 21. Jim asked Sean to carve out 15-20 minutes at the JLCIMT meeting in September to demonstrate the pilot project on mapping the Oregon economy. Sean mentioned that Rep. Nathanson will be the co-Chair of Ways and Means in the 2017 session.

### **Authoritative Data Governance – Theresa Burcsu, Cy Smith**

Cy indicated that the authoritative data governance document that OGIC commissioned from GPL has been used to develop a workflow that OGIC can use to endorse authoritative data and data sources. Theresa presented a graphic flowchart to indicate how that workflow would be managed. She walked through the flowchart. One of the key elements of the workflow is development by FIT theme work groups of a document that lays out the rationale for a particular data set or group of data elements to be endorsed by OGIC as authoritative.

The process is virtually identical to the Framework data standards development and approval process, which has been used successfully for 15 years. If the rationale document is approved by OGIC, the data element or group of elements is considered to be authoritative. The source for the data element(s) may also be part of the rationale and would be considered the authoritative source for that element or elements.

Question was asked about whether this process might change based on the passage of the data sharing legislative concept, whereby OGIC would have statutory authority. Sean indicated that the bill would not grant OGIC authority over anything related to local governments. However, if OGIC is restructured with local governments being more equitably represented, the endorsement of OGIC for particular data elements and sources being authoritative would likely carry more weight with locals.

Question was asked about whether a data element could be defined as authoritative without having an approved standard. The authoritative data document that OGIC commissioned from GPL identifies a number of different types of data that could be authoritative, but that are not all Framework data. Some additional thought needs to be given to whether a data element needs to have an approved standard before it can be declared authoritative. If a data element was endorsed as authoritative but didn't yet have a standard, the next step would need to be developing and approving a standard for that element. The issue will be taken back to FIT and/or GPL, a determination made, and the resolution brought back to OGIC at a future meeting.

### **Framework Prioritization – Theresa Burcsu, Cy Smith**

The Framework Implementation Team has recently begun discussing how best to improve the prioritization process for Framework data development, which will drive how the FIT funds are spent. Emmor Nile has been working on a proposal for prioritization, based on the notion that there are a few fundamental Framework data sets that are required before others can be built. The idea is that FIT would prioritize completion of those fundamental Framework data sets and expend most of their funds to do that before undertaking development of other data elements. That is one strategy that the FIT leads are discussing.

The ideas should be ready for further discussion at the September meeting, and again at the December meeting, where OGIC will likely be asked to weigh in. FIT will likely solicit proposals for

funding the next round of Framework projects in January or February. OGIC will need to approve changes to the process before then, so the December meeting will likely be the right time for that discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

**Next meeting:**

September 14, 2015

10:30am - Noon

155 Cottage St. Conf. Room A

DRAFT