RECAP
Oregon Geographic Information Council

DAS
DEPARTMENT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE
S E R V I C E S

Meeting Date: April 29, 2019

Time: 9:30am – 12:00pm

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

Member Attendees: Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Cy Smith, GEO; Tom Rohlfing, Marion County Assessor; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group; Patrick Gronli, Portland General Electric; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept. (Vice Chair); Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications
Staff/Observers: Pete Boone, Tualatin Valley Water District; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Dan Antonson, DSL; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Kathryn Helms, OSCIO-Chief Data Officer; Nikki Hart-Brinkley, RVCOG; Chris Wright, ODOT; John Stroud, RDI

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Jeff Frkonja, Chair, at 9:30am. With 9 of the 18 voting OGIC members present initially, a quorum was not established for taking votes.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- No additions to the agenda were made. No announcements made.
- Minutes from the January meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

Legislative Recommendation Status

Jeff provided a brief update on the status of the OGIC legislative recommendation. The JLCIMT committee meeting during which Jeff and Cy presented the recommendation went well. The legislators expressed interest in the recommendation and had lots of questions. They were very interested in the potential return on investment for the recommendation. After the hearing, Jeff and Kay met with Kathryn Helms, the State Chief Data Officer to better understand the DAS and OSCIO perspective on the recommendation. After that meeting and several other meetings with legislators, it appears that Rep. Nathanson is amenable to moving forward with a funding bill as long as it prioritizes getting the States house in order before moving forward with funding aimed at other public bodies. That is aligned with the manner in which OSCIO would support proceeding if the recommendation moves forward in the Legislature. Rep. Nathanson would like to see some return on investment from the initial investment, and the evaluation projects in the recommendation would provide that ROI. That perspective seems to be aligned with OSCIO and others. So there seems to be some support to move forward with a scaled down version of the recommendation for the next biennium.

The budget for the next biennium was reworked into five alternatives, and the smallest of those alternatives in the amount of $5M is the one that seems to be preferred. Jeff met with Rep. Marsh the morning of the OGIC meeting and she indicated she would support the smaller alternative if we could align support from the various stakeholders that are involved in the wildfire initiative she has been moving forward, including ODF, State Fire Marshall, and the forestry folks at OSU and UO. The connection between the two is that the OGIC proposal includes one or more wildfire evaluation projects. Cy showed the one page document that was presented to the JLCIMT during the last legislative hearing, to show the smaller budget alternative that is currently being discussed.

Cy then moved to the outreach tracking spreadsheet and walked the group through the most recent outreach activities indicated in the spreadsheet. Various OGIC members in the meeting are responsible for certain outreach activities, and Cy went around the room seeking any updates to the spreadsheet. There wasn't much in the way of specific updates to this spreadsheet during the meeting. Stakeholders are basically in a holding pattern until/if we get a funding bill from JLCIMT. Patrick Gronli did say he was setting up a data sharing meeting with the electric utilities, so there would be an opportunity to discuss the proposal. Cy said he would get contact info to Patrick for some rural electric coops folks that had expressed some interest. Cy indicated that he had gotten some interest from the Soil and Water Conservation Districts and he has passed along some info on the proposal to their leadership. Cy indicated that there wouldn't be any further communication with fee administrator agencies until we get further direction on fees from the Legislature. Cy asked Theresa to follow up on a possible support letter from Oregon URISA. Colleen said she could use some assistance in determining the best way to reach out to local government GIS stakeholders.

There was some discussion about the various types of funds in state and local government that can be tapped to help pay for the OGIC proposal. There was some discussion about having some talking points that indicate the value of the proposal to various agencies and organizations that are supported by the General Fund and other funds that might be tapped to pay for the proposal.

Cy then walked through the financial analysis for which GEO contracted with FCS, Inc. The analysis was done to help determine how the various funding alternatives would possibly work, their impact, etc. Cy presented a few slides that summarized the financial analysis. FCS did a cash flow analysis to help us see how the funding could be set up over the ten year period, what the revenue requirements would be, how debt financing could be used, and what the impact might be for a public/private partnership (P3). FCS and Cy had a teleconference with the leadership at the Alberta Data Partnership, a P3 similar to what OGIC has been considering.

The financial analysis was based on the $16M proposal for the first biennium, so an update based on the smaller proposal is in order. Jeff pointed out that the vast majority of the proposed funding is for data development for missing data. Pete Boone asked why there was money in the analysis for data maintenance. Cy reminded the group that the original proposal includes funding to fill a $13M annual gap in what public bodies are already spending on data maintenance. That funding will flow to various public bodies that are the custodians of the data or an aggregator that has taken on the responsibility for maintaining certain data sets. Kay made the point that the existing federated model is pretty inefficient and over time it will likely be possible to make adjustments to the model to make it more efficient, and possibly more centralized. Those changes will likely change the costs over time. Cy made the point that the total State budget is between $70B and $80B, so the total revenue generated from state agency-administered fees ($3B) is a relatively small, but significant percent.

Brandt asked if the P3 concept required the data be in the public domain. Cy indicated that the data could be in the public domain, but products and services created from the public domain data would be marketed to customers to generate revenue. There would have to be a policy discussion with stakeholders, led by OGIC, to collectively determine how the data would be handled. Right now, the law indicates that the data will be shared between public bodies, even though quite a bit of Framework data is already in the public domain.

Cedric Cooney asked if the list of 1287 fees that have been identified as possible targets to fund the OGIC proposal have been published somewhere. Cy indicated that the list hasn't been published, that the financial analysis is a theoretical exercise at this point, and that it will be necessary to have a lot more eyes on the list if the fee alternative were to move forward.

Performance Measures Update

Cy provided a report on progress made on the development of performance measures for the OGIC proposal. He presented a [short document](#) that lists the proposed performance outcomes, which were agreed upon in the OGIC Strategic Plan. Those are high level outcomes. He then walked through the Performance Measures based on those high level outcomes and explained each one to some extent. As he indicated, some of the proposed performance measures are outcomes measures, but most are output measures. One that is probably an outcome measure is an increase in public body business processes that use Framework data.

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the measures, Kay suggested that we consider associating outcome measures with each phase of the proposal. She also suggested we develop a few performance measures specifically related to the evaluation projects in the initial phase of the proposal. Brandt suggest other possible measures related to helping public bodies decrease their costs and make better decisions. Jeff talked about the interest of legislators in the ROI to be gained from the proposal. He asked the group what State agencies mean when they use the term ROI. Kay mentioned that she has been working with a group of state agency directors that deals with IT investments. That group has been working to determine how to calculate the ROI for major IT investments for replacing large, outdated systems. Ultimately, it's not just about the money, the return on investment also includes non-quantitative factors.

Chris Wright mentioned that the risk of not doing anything and allowing deferred maintenance on a system to grow must be included in the overall ROI calculation. Brandt said he thought we could use tax lot data maintenance as a good example of how we can decrease the cost with standards, improved workflows, better tools, etc. John Waffenschmidt talked about cost avoidance as a factor in ROI, especially when we can eliminate or reduce duplication of effort. But John said it's more difficult to quantity the value-added propositions like what Cy talked about relative to use of the data to produce value-added products and services from the shared data. Patti talked about a measure or ROI being improved service and time-savings in service provision. Public safety uses performance measures like reduced response time, reduced time in call taking, etc. She said that reducing duplicated effort is important to measure. Cy mentioned that there will likely be a measurable ROI from the project that LCOG is working on for OGIC right now, whereby they are determining the best way to create taxing district boundaries (special districts) from tax lot data, without having to digitize those boundaries from legal descriptions, which would be a much more expensive proposition. He also talked about finding ways to determine the impact of Framework data on outcomes like improved ambulance response time.

With the Resource WG winding down, Jeff and Cy indicated they would like to see a few more folks volunteer to work on the Performance Management WG. Brandt volunteered.

Strategic Plan Revisions Update

At the last OGIC meeting, the [Strategic Plan](#) was approved pending a revision. Cy showed the group the revision that was requested and made in Goal 3, Objective 3c, to add the following language at the end of that objective: "…recognizing that there may be regional differences in the need for Framework data based on specific business processes." John Waffenschmidt confirmed that the change satisfied the concern raised in the last OGIC meeting, so the Strategic Plan is approved and the work is completed.

Before moving to the next topic on the agenda, Jeff asked Kathryn Helms, State Chief Data Officer,

if she had anything she'd like to say to the Council. She mentioned that one of her key responsibilities is to develop a strategic data plan for the State, and that she believed that plan should include the importance of geospatial data and the work of OGIC. She talked a bit about ROI from the perspective of the Chief Data Officer. She mentioned that, because ROI is somewhat trendy right now related to data, it can be used to make a difference, but can also be misused. She talked a bit about IT governance providing ROI in the sense of getting agencies to communicate and work together more effectively through the governance structure, which can have a positive impact on collaborative business processes and making better decisions as a result. Jeff followed up with a point about how central services units, such as Metro, have an impact on their partners that could be measured as part of ROI.

OGIC Work Groups and Committees

Theresa presented a few slides related to the Framework Implementation Team (FIT) Charter and the GIS Program Leads (GPL) Charter. She presented changes made recently to the FIT Charter to align better with the statutory authorization for OGIC, and to add two new data theme work groups and to revise the leadership transition process. Jeff reminded the Council that the legislation authorizes the Council to determine what is and is not Framework data, making the FIT organizational structure particularly important. Suggestion made to specifically call out participation in FIT from each sector (state, federal, tribal, regional, local, utilities, higher ed, private sector, etc.). Theresa will make a few modifications to the FIT Charter as suggested in the meeting and bring it back to the next OGIC meeting for approval and adoption.

Theresa also presented the GPL Charter and some recent revisions. GPL has functioned in the past as a technical advisory group to OGIC. It has been in existence as long as OGIC has existed and actually existed in one form or another before OGIC was first formed in 1994. With OGIC's latest formation as a statutory body comprised of a more equitable mix of the various stakeholder sectors, GPL is proposing that they continue with their current structure as a forum for state agencies to coordinate their work, and to provide technical advice to OGIC as needed. When OGIC needs technical advice, GPL proposes to create a temporary work group comprised of all the various stakeholder sectors to more closely resemble the composition of OGIC.

There was some questions and discussion about the composition of GPL. Suggestion made to consider broadening the participation in GPL to include other stakeholders that are statutorily included in OGIC now. Theresa talked about some of the past contributions of GPL to OGIC. Question asked about issues with having other stakeholder participants. Theresa and Cy mentioned that the topics for GPL have been mostly concerned with state government, so other participants outside state government that became involved over time have always eventually dropped out because the meetings didn't serve a purpose for them.

Cy posed the question to OGIC as to whether the Council wants/needs to have a technical advisory committee, and if so, whether the GPL is structured in a way that would enable it to serve as a technical advisory committee for OGIC. Kay mentioned that similar organizational and governance questions are being discussed right now by the various IT groups in state government. Concern expressed that decisions or recommendations made by GPL to OGIC with the current GPL structure would not be representative of the issues and needs of the broader geospatial community represented by OGIC now. Jeff indicated that it seemed to him GPL was going to continue to meet regardless of their connection with OGIC, and that the question before the Council seems to be whether the Council wants to have a specific relationship with GPL. Cy agreed and said that there is tremendous value to be gained by leveraging the knowledge and expertise of the GPL membership. He suggested that the Council should indicate to GPL what they believe the relationship should be.

Theresa reminded the Council that GPL has already indicated that their organizational preference is to keep their structure the same, but to establish a temporary subcommittee or work group comprised of the broader stakeholder community to provide specific technical advice to OGIC.

Jeff restated the discussion to indicate that the Council would like GPL to come back with a more detailed proposal for how they could more reliably and completely meet the needs of the Council when there are technical issues with which the Council needs advice. The ad hoc or temporary nature of a work group as currently suggested doesn't seem durable enough to suit the need. The Council recognizes the problem in the past whereby non-State agencies haven't found the business of GPL to be compelling enough to participate long term.

John Waffenschmidt said he feels like OGIC needs to explain to GPL how they believe the relationship between the two should be structured. Brandt said he believes OGIC wants to hand off technical questions and issues to GPL and know that they will be dealt with in a way that addresses the needs of the entire geospatial community, not just state agencies. He went on to say that he often hears the phrase "Culture eats strategy for breakfast", meaning in this case that unless we find a way to make the relationship with GPL work, their long-standing culture will simply continue, and our strategy of getting them to provide technical advice that meets our broader needs won't come to fruition.

After hearing this additional discussion, Jeff asked for suggestions about how to proceed. Suggestion made to consider establishing a separate technical advisory committee for OGIC, which could include some members of GPL, as well as participants from other stakeholders. That new group wouldn't necessarily need to meet monthly. The relationship between that new group and GPL would need to be worked out. Suggestion made to consider what we would do if we were starting from a blank slate. Suggestion made to provide an opportunity for OGIC members to submit thoughts in the next couple of months as to what the Council needs in a technical advisory committee. Theresa will provide that solicitation of thinking to the Council and set a deadline for submitting those thoughts. A deadline for that thinking was tentatively set for May 31. Kay suggested that we might consider asking the GPL Chair and others to come to the next Council meeting to discuss the matter with us.

Meeting adjourned at 11:59am.

Next Meeting
July 2019, TBD