

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: October 30, 2018

Time: 1:00pm – 4:00pm

Location: 155 Cottage St., Conference Room B

Member Attendees: Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Cy Smith, GEO; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications Agency; Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; Lisa Gaines, OSU-INR; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Steven Hoffert, OYA; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Rep. Mike Nearman, Oregon Legislature; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Renee Davis, OWEB; Jim Rue, DLCD

Staff/Observers: Jed Roberts, DGMI; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Randy Sounhein, DSL; Graham Slater, Employment Dept.; Laer Haider, DHS/OHA; John Stroud, RDI; Cedric Cooney, ODFW

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Jeff Frkonja, Chair, at 1:05pm. With 13 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 July meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

Legislative Recommendation – Jeff

Jeff walked the group through a slide deck, available [here](#), on the Legislative Recommendation document. He made a few remarks about some of the feedback based on outreach:

- Folks are supportive of statewide Framework data development and understand its value
- Federated business model for Framework development and management is widely supported
- Coalition of stakeholders must be developed to support this, outreach must be expanded
- Funding recommendation isn't in Governor's budget, but legislators didn't see that as a concern
- Tapping fees as a funding mechanism is generally supported, but some differences over how
- Debt financing is somewhat supported, reaction mixed, including some support for General Fund
- P3 concept reaction mixed, some hesitance but some enthusiasm; misunderstanding about idea

Cy mentioned that most of the feedback in the Strategic Plan Listening Sessions came from the geospatial community, as opposed to elected officials or others, and they were very supportive.

Expenditure Proposal

Initial discussion was around how much funding would be requested in 2019-21 biennium (\$2M for GEO and \$16M for program and project management, capacity building for local and regional governments, and two pilot evaluation projects that will involve some data development for a coastal project and some for a wildfire project in eastern Oregon. Questions asked about what would be done specifically on the additional funding amount, beyond the \$2M for GEO. Council indicated a need for more detail on that larger expenditure. Rep. Nearman indicated that the size of the second part of the request (\$16M) wouldn't be considered too large, based on the fact that the Legislature passed the initial bill to initiate this program. Cy talked a bit about what would be done with the larger portion of the funding, but indicated that more detail would be added to the document before it is finalized and sent back for OGIC review. Much of that detail was still missing in the version of the

document sent to OGIC for review prior to this meeting.

Comment made that the initial ask must stand up capability to securely share existing Framework data with all public bodies. Comment made that part of the activities completed with the larger portion of the funding request in 2019-21 must be to evaluate the results of the pilot, prioritize future activities, and develop the request for the larger requests in future biennia. Comment made that having the State Resilience Officer supportive of a coastal and a wildfire project both related to resilience would be very important to make the value more concrete, and would also help make the case for the value to local governments. Comment made that doing a pilot for all coastal counties would be useful because they represent a microcosm of the GIS capability situation statewide, low to high capabilities. Tool as part of pilot that help local governments do their environmental reporting to the state would be helpful.

Jeff summarized the discussion at that point related to the document, that the Council would be satisfied if the portions of the document related to the larger funding request for 2019-21 are completed with more detail about what will be done, including two pilot projects, and the amount of funding related to each component of the request is completed. Suggestion made to name sponsors of the pilot projects (Mike Harryman for both?). Suggestion made to check in with DOGAMI since they've been working for a long time on data related to the tsunami line and other coastal hazard data. Comment made that the new tsunami line that has been proposed has been somewhat controversial and is not settled yet. Comment made that we may want to consider a smaller coastal pilot with more detailed, complete data. Work needs to be done in the future to scope the pilots properly, so we should probably be a bit less detailed about the language describing the pilots in the report. It may be that we know more about the pilots and their scope before we finalize the report for the Legislative Session in February or March.

Cedric Cooney from ODFW asked to address the Council and made the point that data collection is necessary to support data development statewide. He indicated that the estimate for Framework data development doesn't really include enough in the cost estimates for data collection from ODFW's perspective. He talked about achieving a desired future state and that he wasn't sure if the cost estimates currently put forward would achieve that desired future state. Jeff mentioned that this is why we are starting with an evaluation stage in 2019-21, to try to develop more certainty around the cost estimates for Framework data development and management.

Funding Recommendation

Funding recommendation is comprised of three primary proposals: tap small portion of existing fees (development permits, various licenses, etc.); debt funding; POP. Recommendation requests funding for first two years, while laying out cost estimates for 8-10 year period. Jeff asked if Council approved of that approach. Point made that we are late in terms of asking for re-allocation of fees through executive branch process. Point made that POP is already in the Agency Request Budget, will hopefully be in the Governor's Request Budget. Council agreed that it was appropriate to ask for only first two years of funding.

Jeff reviewed three options for fees: Tap all 2500 fees at about 1%; tap targeted fees that need Framework data at about 3%; tap selected fees that need Framework data and can more easily absorb a larger percentage. After some discussion about the pros and cons of three options, the Council agreed that the most appropriate approach was probably to make a prioritized recommendation starting with 1) tap selected fees (couple dozen), 2) tap targeted fees (~1000) and 3) tap all 2500 fees. So the document will be reordered to indicate the Council's preference, but we'll still ask the Legislature for their feedback and opinion on the best approach, and if fees are an appropriate solution. Some discussion about whether we are asking fee administrators to raise their fees or to absorb costs associated with Framework data without raising their fees; no conclusion on

that question. Point made that citizens who purchase permits or licenses would be the ones funding Framework data that supports those programs. Point made that there are a variety of rules and regulations that direct what fee administrators can do and how their funds can be spent, although many have some latitude. Fiscal impact of tapping fees has not been considered at this point. More information needs to be gathered on how fees operate, the impact of tapping various fees, etc. Point made that value to the public is an important consideration in determining the best approach to tapping fees. Some analytical work is ongoing at GEO related to the fee options, but will not be concluded by the time the preliminary report has to be submitted for the December JLCIMT meeting.

Debt Recommendation

Research has indicated that debt financing seems to be feasible from an accounting rules perspective for most of the expenditures we're proposing. Point made that debt financing has worked for data development at the local level because it fits the model of infrastructure development in that it requires a large upfront investment to build and then a smaller sustainable investment to maintain. Debt is proposed to front load the costs and accelerate the data development. However, most of the Legislators we've talked to have said they don't really want to use debt, even if not repaid by General Fund. At least one Legislator suggested that using General Fund to pay for accelerated data development would be the preference, so we've added that option to the document. Point made that it would be good to at least look at what the costs would look like over the same time frame using debt vs. pay as you go, considering that the debt service raises the overall cost. That might extend the timeframe for data development somewhat. Resource Work Group will evaluate this option and put together some illustrative graphs of the debt vs. pay as you go options, including some research on the process. Point made that an option might be to borrow money for the first two year period (~16M), after which fee revenue may have accumulated sufficiently to operate on a pay as you go basis.

Jeff suggested that this is another item for which we want to ask the Legislature for their opinion in the JLCIMT meeting in December. Point made that the result of this proposal will have a significant value to the public and private business, and that we should consider going after Lottery funds that have been set aside for economic development. This data, if made available to the public, would level the playing field for many small businesses. Right now, this data will be securely shared between public bodies, but it will likely result in a lot more data being created in the public domain, too. The document will be revised based on discussion today, then OGIC will have a final opportunity for feedback before document is sent to JLCIMT on Nov. 16.

Strategic Planning

Cy presented some slides from the Strategic Planning Work Group (SPWG), available [here](#). The slides contain a summary of the work group's activities and the five high level Goals that were agreed upon at the last Council meeting for the Plan, proposed outcomes for each of the five goals, as well as more detailed proposed objectives for each of the five Goals. The primary scope of the Plan is statewide geospatial data management and coordination, with a secondary focus on geospatial Framework data management and coordination.

Mission statement: "Authoritative, reliable geospatial data is available and accessible when and where needed by Oregonians."

Vision statement: "Providing suitable access to accurate, authoritative and relevant geographic information and technology supports consistent government services across the state." 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 business needs to be addressed and an analysis of the challenges and opportunities for the future state, both of which will

likely be included as an appendix in order to keep the body of the Plan relatively short and more easily consumable.

The five high level goals are a. Data Sharing & Accessibility, b. Data Stewardship, c. Collaborative Governance, d. Effective Communications, and e. Sustainable Funding. Objectives for each Goal, to indicate how that goal will be accomplished, are presented in the slides linked to these minutes above. The goals will be stated in more complete language which the Strategic Plan work group is developing. Data stewardship includes data governance, but aspects of data governance will also likely be included under collaborative governance and data sharing & accessibility. Cy walked through each of the objectives and laid out some of the thinking that has been done related to many of the objectives.

We are looking for use cases that illustrate uses of geospatial data and/or geospatial technology to include in the Strategic Plan. Theresa will provide a use case template and place to document use cases. Point made that there's a lot of work to do in terms of identifying and describing how geospatial Framework data will be maintained in the future, as we begin to operate more as an enterprise rather than 1500 separate public bodies. Point made that customized talking points for different areas would make them more relevant, with different issues addressed in different areas. Point made by Jeff that it is becoming more and more important that each Council member begin communicating with their constituency about the legislative proposal and other work the Council is doing, using the talking points.

Next steps: The Strategic Plan work group will meet in early December to work on the objectives and outcomes, as well as identifying challenges and opportunities. The draft plan will be produced in time for review by the Council before the late January OGIC meeting.

Tracking Indicators

At the April OGIC meeting, 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.

Since that time, Allyson Ford has left State government and resigned from OGIC. Molly has volunteered for the Tracking Indicators Work Group, as has Renee Davis, Theresa Burcsu and Rachel Smith. Cy asked if Lisa and Jerri would be able to help with this group and they tentatively agreed. The group will try to meet in December, but it will likely be early January. Cy will send some material for the group to review prior to meeting. Cy evaluated and summarized the work of the Council in the exercise at the April meeting and will send that to the group.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm.

Next Meeting

January 2019, TBD