

# RECAP

## Oregon Geographic Information Council

**Meeting Date:** December 14, 2016

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

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

**Attendees:** Chair: Jim Rue, DLCD; Cy Smith, GEO; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Josh Tanner, GEO; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT; Phil Smith, ODOT; Terry Morganson, Esri; Arron Heriford, DHS/OHA; Eric Hiebenthal, BLM; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Mary, DOR; Ken Smith, OWRD; Ian Madin, DGMI; Don Pettit, DEQ; Tanya Haddad, DLCD; Corey Plank, BLM

### Introductions & Announcements & Approval of Minutes

- Meeting was called to order by Chair, Jim Rue at 10:30am.
- Minutes from September meeting were approved.
- No announcements or additions to the agenda were made or requested.

### GPL Report – Randy Sounhein

Randy announced this was his last report for GPL to OGIC, and introduced Phil Smith, ODOT, as the incoming GPL Chair.

GPL has been discussing the concept of a project portfolio for tracking agency GIS projects and activities, to get a better understanding of GIS use in state government and looking for ways to coordinate and operate more efficiently together. The group hasn't made any conclusions or taken any action on the concept yet, but there was discussion about including it as part of any GIS shared services initiative that may happen in the future across state government. There was a legislative concept on GIS shared services, which mirrored the governance structure language in the data sharing bill. That concept was pulled by the Governor recently, so it won't be going forward. That concept included a mandate to state agencies to develop a project portfolio of GIS activities and projects. If we move forward with a portfolio management system, we will need to make sure it's something that is easy to use. GPL hasn't discussed specifics on such a tool. Dave Ringeisen said that ODOT had tried such an effort in the past, but they couldn't find the right level of detail that users would continue to populate. DAS has a project portfolio tool that is available for us to use, but it's probably too complicated to be of general, widespread use. GPL will continue to discuss this.

Esri has been attending the GPL meetings regularly over the last year or so, and have helped facilitate some technical discussions related to Esri software use, which has been very helpful.

GPL has continued the discussion on the Oregon Lambert Coordination System, which has been a best practice guideline. GPL is interested in formalizing the use of this coordination system by codifying it within the ODOT system of governance for coordination systems. Brady Callahan brought that idea to the ODOT administrative rules work group that he has been participating in on behalf of OGIC. They asked for a formal request or recommendation from OGIC. GPL brought the matter to OGIC, asking for formal action. GPL discussed it further, but had not come to a conclusion yet. Meanwhile, ODOT suggested it wasn't appropriate within their purview.

In other words, the work group doesn't believe it makes sense to include this custom coordinate system in the Administrative Rule for survey coordinate systems. GPL has decided the best approach is to strengthen the language we publish related to broad use of the Oregon Lambert Coordinate System. In the meantime, there will be a new datum in 2022, which will likely be another opportunity to address this issues, to ensure wider use of the Oregon Lambert Coordinate System. This system is published in the EPSG system, which means it is available for use within most GIS software. GPL will form a subcommittee or work group specifically to address this issue. One key issue, when the new datum is released, is to make sure that everyone using this coordinate system moves to the new datum and we don't have some data sets in one datum and some in another. That may require rule making.

### **Framework Data Report – Theresa Burcsu**

Slides for Theresa's report are posted [here](#). She covered two primary things: Framework funding strategy and ongoing activities. The group developed short and long term funding goals to guide a redirection of the funding strategy. Theresa walked the Council through the basic characteristics of the Framework program as a further basis for the funding strategy. She showed us the work that the FIT has been doing to define Foundational Data Elements for the Oregon Framework. The graphic is deliberately out of focus to indicate that this is a work in progress and that it is not all-inclusive, but is representative. The basic idea is that we should be focused primarily on completing the Foundational Data Elements, rather than expending limited resources more broadly while leaving the foundation incomplete.

Theresa led the Council through a bit more detail on each of the goals and the strategies to achieve those goals. She then indicated the next steps that the FIT group will take to complete the Framework funding strategy, in advance of initiating the call for proposals for Framework data development projects. Don Pettit made the point that we need to change the wording on the Key Characteristics slide to indicate that we will provide and ensure some funding for non-Foundational projects, as opposed to what the slide says now (non-priority projects).

Cy made the point that the funding we are prioritizing is the Framework funds that state agencies provide through the GEO assessment. We use these funds as seed capital, and have leveraged those funds at about a 7:1 ratio over the last 16 years. Theresa mentioned that the ongoing project to update the Spatial Data Library at the Oregon Explorer website should deliver a new version of the SDL in the April/May timeframe.

Theresa completed the presentation related to Framework funding strategies with a slide indicating the milestones and schedule for the proposal process for Framework projects. Theresa finished the Framework Report with a slide on other Framework activities, including brief updates on the work of six of the Framework Implementation Teams. Four teams are undergoing some leadership shifts and efforts are underway on three of those teams to find the right person to lead. On Imagery, Theresa, Cy and Brady Callahan are working to get an RFP released for 1 foot resolution statewide aerial imagery, with 6 inch resolution imagery for many urban areas. And finally, we have started to make some good progress within the Utilities FIT, a new Power Lines work group that has started meeting under the leadership of Micah Babinski, BLM.

### **Use of Crowd-Sourced Data – Cy Smith**

Cy highlighted the ongoing work of TriMet in using and updating Open Street Map (OSM) as their primary base map. They do this work as part of the OSM community for at least 7 counties in an extended Portland metro area, including some extension into Washington. They validate the work

done by others in the community outside of their organization, including members of the public. This is a key element in making this kind of approach work.

In addition, Cy indicated that he had been asked to meet with Ed Flick, the Marion County Emergency Operations Manager. He wants GEO to supply about 100 ArcGIS Online user seats to staff in hospitals, PSAPS, police and fire stations, schools, and others to do damage assessment after disasters. They want to use the City of Salem SAFE situational awareness tool as a decision support system, going beyond its current capabilities as a visualization tool. OEM's RAPTOR system is a similar visualization tool that many first responders use and that SAFE connects with to consume certain data sets, and to share certain data sets. To augment the SAFE system, they will need to do some custom development of SAFE and AGOL. They would use the AGOL Collector tool to provide data to SAFE related to damage assessments. They conducted a proof of concept during the Cascadia Rising exercise and now want to take the next step with a pilot project involving Marion, Columbia and Lincoln counties. This will also involve validating crowd-sourced data.

They will also use this tool for emergency response, which means the validation of the data needs to be more rigorous. Seeing crowd-sourced data being used in emergency response made it seem like we needed to start paying more attention to this and begin talking about ways to organize, manage and coordinate these kinds of activities across government, at a minimum. Cy told the Council that he, Ed Flick and several others from county and city government met with Mike Harryman, the Governor's Resiliency Officer, and Shannon Marheine with the Oregon Public Safety Fusion Center, and Mike and Shannon were very interested in being involved in a pilot project.

Arron Heriford expressed the idea that it might make sense to use crowd-sourced data as a stop gap measure where authoritative data doesn't exist, but that there are programs to collect that data for public safety purposes and they should be funded more fully to do their work. Sean McSpaden noted that Cy's introductory remarks started with a single data set, road centerline, and expanded to included collection of a lot of data along the entire public safety continuum. If the data related to damage assessment or emergency response is coming from official sources in hospitals, schools, etc., that's one thing, but if the data is coming from citizen sensors (phones, iPads, etc.), that could be a problem. Cy clarified that Ed is talking about data coming from public officials related to emergency response, damage assessment, etc.

Sean thought we should take a more focused approach and conduct a pilot project with a single type of data and/or type of tool and develop a workflow that will be effective. He went on to say that it would be good to develop a set of data and tools and workflow in a relatively small geography that could serve as a model for the rest of the state.

Eric Hiebenthal noted that we need to have Framework data to share if we are going to communicate in this arena prior to an emergency event. The other issue is determining what data we need to share during an event. The methodology for the two types of events can be and should be handled differently. Don mentioned that PrepFIT would like to be part of the discussion of the pilot project that Ed Flick and others are working on. Arron mentioned that there are people in every hospital that are supposed to be reporting to a central system for damage assessment, etc. Dave mentioned that ODOT has started working with Waze to improve their processes in responding to events, such as traffic accidents, road problems, etc. Cy said we need more resources to manage and validate crowd-sourced data, but we will likely save significant money as compared to each organization trying to collect such detailed and comprehensive data themselves.

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

Sean noted that at the JLC/IMT meeting on December 12, the committee was notified that there isn't

yet a fully agreed upon legislative concept for them to consider introducing in pre-Session filing. He reminded the Council that a similar bill was introduced prematurely in the 2016 Session and didn't move forward because it didn't have widespread support. While Sean received a draft of the legislative concept from Legislative Counsel the morning of the hearing, there are still a few differences between that version and the version that the Stakeholder Work Group gave to Legislative Counsel, and those differences need to be worked out before the concept is introduced as a bill.

One of the differences involves use of the term 'aggregator', which in this case means a public body that serves as a data aggregator for geospatial Framework data that other public bodies collect or develop and for which the other public bodies are the custodian. The Work Group had agreed to use that term in the concept, but Legislative Counsel didn't like it. The compromise we reached with Counsel was to include the concept of aggregation in the definition of geospatial data, without using the term aggregator for the organization doing the work.

Cy noted that the reason the aggregation issue is important is that it ensures that the geospatial Framework data that is shared with an aggregator will be shared with GEO, but that the aggregator can't be compelled through a public records request to share that data with other public bodies themselves. Without paying attention to this issue, the idea of sharing data with all public bodies through the Spatial Data Library at GEO would still be possible, but it would also open the door to having public bodies mandated to share directly with each other, with hundreds of data requests between public bodies every year. We want to avoid this.

Another issue that Sean brought up was the language that indicated that OGIC would be under the authority of the State CIO, which the Stakeholder Group specifically wanted to eliminate. Sean mentioned a few other salient points related to the content of the proposed legislative concept. He noted the timeline we will follow to meet with the Stakeholder Work Group in January to finalize the draft concept. Sean was asked to speculate about changes to the JLCIMT in the upcoming session. He said there may be a few changes, but it's likely that Rep. Nathanson will remain as co-Chair. It's likely that Sen. Steiner-Hayward will move off the Committee. Thus far, the Committee fully supports the concept and wants to move it forward as soon as the Stakeholder Group is ready. One other issue that the Work Group is still evaluating is membership of the Council and how to set it up so that there's enough flexibility to find and keep the right people on the Council who will be active and interested.

There was some discussion at the close of the meeting regarding the rationale for delaying the mandate to share data, to give the Council time to form, to devise a funding model for helping local governments develop and share data, etc. Even if there's no new money, the savings from better coordination and sharing should be significant, eliminating any hit on the General Fund in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04pm.

### **Next Meeting**

March 15, 2017, 10:30am - Noon  
*Conference Room A, Executive Office Building  
155 Cottage St. NE, Salem, OR 97301*

DRAFT