

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: April 27, 2018
Time: Noon – 4:00pm
Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room A

Member Attendees: Cy Smith, GEO; Dean Anderson, Oregon URISA; Allyson Ford, OHA Public Health; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept.; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications Agency; Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; Lisa Gaines, OSU-INR; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Patrick Gronli, NW Natural Gas; Renee Davis, OWEB; Jeff Frkonja, Portland Metro; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Steven Hoffert, OYA
Staff/Observers: Jed Roberts, DGMI; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Rachel Smith, DLCD; Sean McSpaden, LFO; Dan Antonson, DSL

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Jeff Frkonja at 12:15pm. With 15 of the 21 voting [OGIC members](#) present, a quorum was established for conducting business.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- No additions to the [agenda](#) were made or requested. No announcements made.
- [Minutes](#) from the January meeting were approved, including the addition of Kay Erickson as an attendee.
- Jeff made several comments regarding meeting logistics: Chair's primary duties are to make sure members are heard and that business gets conducted. He asked for hands to be raised to be recognized before speaking. He asked members to raise points of order if they have an issue with how things are going. He will make an effort to change hats when he's moving from his role as Chair to his role as representative of regional governments.

Charter Deliberations – All

The Council took up the draft Charter document which included proposed revisions from the previous meeting and interim suggestions. That proposed revised draft Charter is attached to these notes [here](#). The group agreed with all proposed changes, but there was one issue noted in the draft that needed to be addressed in this meeting. That issue related to how the overlap in terms for Chair and Vice-Chair should work. The Council also discussed the possibility of proposing changes to the statute to define staggered terms for members, so that the entire Council wouldn't be likely to turn over every few years. Ultimately, it was agreed that this isn't something we need to address in our charter right now.

On the Chair and Vice-Chair overlap, a proposal was made and accepted to elect a Vice-Chair annually from this point forward. The Vice-Chair will serve one year as Vice-Chair, then transition to Chair and a new Vice-Chair will be elected. There was also discussion about what to do if the Chair wasn't discharging the responsibilities of the position appropriately. Suggestion made to also select an alternate, and to add the position of Past Chair. Dean suggested that the Oregon URISA Chapter has a charter that deals with the issue related to the Chair not discharging the duties and could be a good template. Cy will look at that charter and add appropriate language to the OGIC Charter.

A proposal was made and accepted to add a statement in the Council Duties section to indicate that there is more detail in the statute and reference the statute there. A proposal was made and accepted to add that the Council would review the Charter periodically and propose needed revisions to the statute if appropriate.

Adoption of Charter tabled, changes will be made and revised version sent out for electronic approval before next Council meeting.

Funding Mechanism for Framework Data Sharing – Jeff Frkonja

Jeff Frkonja led the funding mechanism discussion and presented slides that are posted [here](#). Purpose of the working group is to bring back to OGIC at the July meeting a well formed recommendation on this issue, how to eliminate fees public bodies charge each other for Framework data, for Council decision making. A legislative concept placeholder has been filed in case any of the Council's recommendations require legislative action. He mentioned that there is some preliminary work done by work group members since the last OGIC meeting, posted at these links:

- http://www.oregon.gov/geo/OGIC%20Documents/RegionalSurvey_collated_anonymized.pdf
- <http://www.oregon.gov/geo/OGIC%20Documents/Annual%20Local%20Government%20Framework%20ExpendituresV3.pdf>
- http://www.oregon.gov/geo/FIT%20Forum%20Documents/22nd_Forum-2018FrameworkDataInventoryAndAssessment_20180315.pdf
- <http://www.oregon.gov/geo/FIT%20Documents/FDIA-Questions-Clarifying-Language.pdf>

Work continues to finalize this information. The work group characterizes the full issue as a need to address the overall shortfall between current funding for Framework data and what is needed to complete and maintain it. This will provide efficiencies due to elimination of duplicated effort, which will allow public bodies to do more work. The value proposition for statewide Framework data development and maintenance, however, goes beyond eliminating duplicated effort. The work group proposes that the value proposition from statewide Framework data is provision of consistent government services across the state.

As noted and linked in preliminary form above, the work group and OGIC's Framework Implementation Teams are now gathering costs for Framework completion and maintenance, as well as estimating fees charged by public bodies to each other for Framework data. They are also estimating the total capital and operational expenditures needed for Framework data going forward. Question asked about whether we are estimating the costs from an operational or a project perspective; the answer is both. Key point is that we need to identify the gap between what is funded now or likely to be funded in the timeframe we need to complete the work, and the total need.

Question asked about the need for Framework data, whether we have answered that question already. Cy indicated that the question has been answered, the needs have been identified in the past, but we need to answer it again. However, we are operating in a very compressed timeframe because of various deadlines related to Legislative and state budgets. The strategic plan will be an opportunity to answer the question again, but that has a bit longer timeframe than the funding/resource issue. Cy will send the Council some information from past attempts to answer this question.

Point was made that we'll have to articulate the need for every dataset now in order to get the answer we want regarding resources. Point made that we are trying to leverage existing investments that have been and are continuing to be made by making the data better, more complete, and more widely available. Point made that we need to have and articulate a plan for how we will complete each dataset before we seek funding, and that we are clear on what we will do with

any funding we may receive.

Debt service being considered as one part of resource solution. Considerable competition for debt financing is recognized. Sean mentioned that he has had conversations internally at LFO about this possibility and hasn't been kicked out of anyone's office. Sean will get the Council some information about the criteria for establishing data as a capital, bondable asset. Other potential funding sources being considered would be used to service the debt. Public/private partnerships is one potential funding option the work group has discussed. Slide in Jeff's presentation describes it. Cy provided more detail in response to questions from the Council in terms of how it works in Canada now.

Further Council feedback on WG ideas:

- Would like to hear how Provinces are managing the P3 partnerships, how it works, etc.
- P3s can be time-consuming and complex, this may be difficult to incorporate in recommendation
- HB2906 enables the Council to establish administrative rules that could help us to implement whatever resource mechanism we and the Legislature determines is appropriate
- ODOT has used P3 concept with Oregon Bridge Development Partners successfully; Legislature is a bit gun shy about P3s partly because the health care initiative partnership failed and partly because the legislation that enables P3s exempts such partnerships from a wide variety of procurement laws and other rules.
- We want the resource we are developing to work as a data utility
- The Council needs more information, there's a lot of work to do to provide enough for the Council to make decisions about how to approach the Legislature and how to advocate for specifics.
- We are developing and supporting an asset, we need to specify what we are developing and how it will be used. The more specificity we can articulate, the more successful we will be.
- Council needs more information about the prioritization of datasets; that will be provided soon.
- Council should identify and articulate the full plan for developing and supporting the Framework data assets, but with prioritization so that it can be developed in phases, as possible.
- Coming back again and again to ask Legislature for more resources can poison the well unless we articulate the full plan upfront and let them understand what we are requesting now.
- We should ask for everything we need, but be prepared to respond to what would be lost if we don't get all of it.
- We will need all Council members to help with advocacy for our request. We will be competing with a lot of other priorities, but what we are proposing is supportive of nearly all government activities.
- Unless we can get this concept fleshed out more completely and make a strong case for it, we are likely to only get seed money to explore further in the next session.
- The work group will need to check with various stakeholders and legislators regarding the ideas we're considering prior to finalizing.

Strategic Planning

Cy presented some slides from the Strategic Planning Work Group, available [here](#). The slides contain a summary of the work group's activities and the five high level goals that the work group is considering for the Plan. Council was asked whether they thought the audience for the Plan should be the folks that are savvy about geospatial data and technology, or if it should include the general population. Feedback on that question from the Council:

- Plan should be built for folks who aren't savvy, but it should be built from the best information. Language can't be too technical, but the technical concepts need to be the basis for it.

- We should have listening sessions that educate and inform folks about the Plan.
- There's a lot of discontent with decisions being made in Salem that affect the entire state.
- Having a legislator on the Strategic Planning WG would be very helpful. Cy will ask Representative Nearman to join the work group.
- Work group might want to go through exercise to identify the audiences for the Plan and then align the goals, objectives, and narrative with the audiences. If your grandmother and your 15 year old nephew gets it, job well done.
- Work group will need the help of the Council members to get the broader audience in the room for listening sessions. We should also use virtual technology to get feedback from a broader, wider audience.
- For in person meetings, we should have Council members talking to their constituents, like Tom Rohlfing talking to the County Assessors. This also helps get the work out more widely, rather than just having the Strategic Planning WG doing all the meetings/sessions.
- Mission and vision need to be simple to speak to a wider audience. Goals and objectives need to be more detailed and technical.
- Need to pay particular attention to the perspectives of the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology.
- A few use cases should be in the Plan to illustrate key objectives for important constituencies
- Need a communication plan with a legislative strategy for delivery of the strategic message
- That message would be used by OGIC to ensure consistency; precise language is important
- Strategic Plan should be outcome based

Mission statement proposed: "Authoritative geospatial data is available and accessible when and where needed by Oregonians." The word 'authoritative' has been somewhat controversial, but OGIC's technical and policy committees were commissioned by the Council a few years ago with preparing a [document](#) that articulated what that word means and how the Council could identify authoritative data and authoritative data sources. There's a need to have someone in government identify authoritative Framework data and authoritative sources for that data to guide the user community.

Point was made that it takes too long to define the word authoritative, which makes the mission statement inaccessible. Better words might be 'reliable' or 'trustworthy' or 'authenticated' or 'validated'. But authoritative has an intuitive meaning to most. Unfortunately, the intuitive understanding is one of two or three things, which is also problematic.

Vision statement presented in the slides. It's one run on sentence, which is obviously a problem. Work group will refine this. Strategic Plan outline presented in the slides. It will include a summary of the work plan with responsibilities and timing, as well as outcomes (success indicators). Plan will also include a SWOT analysis of the future state.

The five high level goals are a. Collaborative Governance, b. Sustainable Funding, c. Data Sharing & Accessibility, d. Data Stewardship, and e. Effective Communications. Each goal will have three or so objectives to indicate how that goal will be accomplished. The goals will be stated in more complete language. Data stewardship includes data governance, but aspects of that objective will also likely be included under collaborative governance and data sharing & accessibility.

Budget Policy Option Package

Cy opened discussion of the [Geospatial Enterprise Office's \(GEO's\) budget proposal](#) for the 2019-2021 biennium, called a Policy Option Package (POP). This budget proposal would be added to the

current service level budget for GEO, and would increase the assessment that is made against every state agency's budget by about \$487,238 per year, as currently configured. The rest of the cost indicated in the POP is a one-time cost that would come from a direct General Fund appropriation.

The Council is asked to make recommendations to the State CIO regarding this POP. Those recommendations need to be finalized by the July OGIC meeting to meet internal DAS deadlines for finalizing budget proposals. Cy indicated that there has traditionally been difficulty getting a POP approved through the DAS process, and that he has tried to get POPs approved at various funding levels every biennium for 18 years, with only one making it past the DAS process. The current POP has made it through most of the DAS hurdles as currently configured, but would undergo further scrutiny if OGIC recommends modifications.

At the last OGIC meeting in January, there was some initial discussion of the POP, with the consensus being that it seemed like the ongoing staff resources might not be enough to meet the stated need. The positions requested in this POP, as well as the rest of the requested funding, would be available starting July 1, 2019. There would be six months available with full staffing, assuming GEO is ready to hire staff and they start July 1, to develop the data sharing platform for securely sharing Framework data with thousands of staff from public bodies. The GEO staff augmentation would also enable training of staff from public bodies to develop, maintain and share Framework data in areas where it is not currently happening. There will also be a need for expanded communications across all public bodies to ensure Framework data is properly developed, maintained and shared over time.

Cy mentioned that he had very recently had conversations about this POP and other Council matters with Rep. Nathanson and Sen. Steiner-Hayward and they both encouraged him to ask for the resources that are needed, don't short-change the need, fully justify what is being requested, and be prepared to indicate what would be lost or not possible if Legislators ask what could be done with less. That advice was intended to apply to the larger resource request discussed earlier in the meeting, as well.

There was some discussion about whether to include all or part of the POP in the resource request the Council is considering, as discussed earlier. In particular, it may be wise to include the one-time costs related to technology development (capital costs) with the larger resource request, since it is basically a capital asset expenditure request. The remaining, ongoing operational costs would be kept in this POP, consisting of staff and hardware/software maintenance, upgrades, and web development/ enhancements.

There was some discussion about adding two more positions to the POP, one more coordination position and one more technical position, to fully accommodate the need for working with many more public bodies and managing significantly more data. There was also mention made of the potential for starting some or all of the new positions as limited duration positions, with the possibility of making them permanent or giving them up later depending on how the need plays out.

Some expressed a need for background information about what GEO does and will do going forward, and how requested resources will be used to meet future requirements. For some, there isn't enough information provided in the POP document to have an informed opinion about adequacy of the POP or the need for more or less resources. Cy will attempt to provide more information in this regard in the near future. He indicated that he was trying to strike the right balance between providing sufficient detail without overwhelming the Council with too much information.

Tracking Indicators

Allyson Ford and Molly Earle discussed the concept of logic models as a guide for OGIC to identify performance metrics. Allyson walked the Council through [examples of everyday logic models](#) we all use, then showed a document that describes the various [components of logic models](#) in more detail, including identification of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts related to program development.

They guided the Council through a short exercise to begin the completion of a logic model for the Council's work related to its statutory directives. Molly described the exercise and walked through the blank logic model to be used. She showed that [model with one example](#) Cy developed for this purpose. The Council divided into groups of three people and worked on the exercise for about 10 minutes, then each group reported out what they had developed. The Council established a new Tracking Indicators Work Group, which will use the results of this exercise as a starting point for their work.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

Next Meeting

July 23, 2018, 8:00am – Noon

*Conference Room A, Executive Office Building
155 Cottage St. NE, Salem, OR 97301*