

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: July 31, 2019

Time: 1:00pm – 4:00pm

Location: 635 Capitol St. NE, Basement Conference Room, Salem

Member Attendees: Jeff Frkonja, Metro (Chair); Cy Smith, GEO; Tom Rohlifing, Marion County Assessor; John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Kay Erickson, Employment Dept. (Vice Chair); Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Renee Davis, OWEB; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Dave Stuckey, OMD; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Steven Hoffert, OYA

Staff/Observers: Rachel Smith, DLCD; Theresa Burcsu, GEO; Kathryn Helms, OSCIO-Chief Data Officer; John Stroud, RDI;

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Kay Erickson, Vice Chair, at 1:00pm. With 13 of the 18 voting [OGIC members](#) present, a quorum was established for conducting business and taking votes.
- Introductions were made by members and observers.
- No additions to the [agenda](#) were made. No announcements made.
- [Minutes](#) from the April meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.

Legislative Recommendation

Jeff provided a brief update on the [status of the OGIC legislative recommendation](#) made in the last Legislative session. Bottom line, due to a variety of factors that included not being in the Governor's budget and the many other issues that demanded the attention of the key legislators that were champions of this effort, we were not able to land this proposal in this session. Constituency groups represented by OGIC members indicated they would prefer to mobilize their support around a specific bill, which we didn't have. So next time, we need to get a specific funding bill early in the session.

Jeff proposed that the OGIC Resource Work Group be asked to take on the work to develop a funding request to the Legislature next session. We should merge our recommendation for funding with other executive branch initiatives, scale the ask to fit a shorter timeframe and identified priorities, emphasize the ROI, and then try again in the 2020 Legislature. Next step would be to have Resource WG craft a communication to the State CIO to ask that a funding request be made for OGIC to the Legislature.

Theme of legislative hearing where OGIC proposal was made was a desire by legislators to understand the ROI, identifying what the citizens will get out of this investment. ROI is about value, not necessarily about financial gain. Legislature needs our proposal to be less vague, more tangible. Our request next time needs to lead with outcomes, not with tactics.

Kathryn had a few words to say about her perspectives on the OGIC recommendation. Her role includes setting an enterprise data strategy. She said there were so many use cases identified during our presentations to legislative committees that it was hard to focus on a few important ones. Also, the amount of the ask was initially difficult for some to justify, with \$16M being several times

more than the current total budget for the CDO's office. That much additional funding was difficult to justify without a more specific use case in mind. She said the Legislature is expecting her to come to them with a vision for what a fully staffed Office of the Chief Data Officer would look like, including the staffing needs of the Geospatial Enterprise Office. She would also like to be able to advocate for a reasonable concept of what the GEOHub would be able to accomplish. She said that picking a specific use case, like disaster response and emergency services, might be good. If it was something in the \$3-5M range that would let the purpose of the OGIC legislation shine, beyond just creating and sharing data, something that was built that had a direct benefit to a community, a state agency, a local government, etc., would be powerful.

Jeff talked about how best to communicate our recommendation to the Legislature going forward. He mentioned again the need to be specific about outcomes, and specific about who would benefit and how. He also mentioned that we would need to engage stakeholders more effectively in advocating for the recommendation.

Speaking from the same slide deck Jeff used, Cy briefly summarized the preliminary outline of what could become an OGIC funding recommendation for the 2020 Legislative Session. Because there would only be about a year left in the biennial budget, the total dollar amount would be about half the final recommendation from the 2019 Session, so in the range of \$2.5M. It could include the costs for three staff and technology costs for the GEOHub portal (~\$1M). It could also include some project and program management funds (\$200K), data sharing evaluation projects (\$1M), and data standardization and aggregation work (\$300K).

Jeff asked if OGIC is comfortable tasking the Resource WG with moving forward to prepare a funding recommendation for OGIC to make to the 2020 Legislature. That work would include some research on the best way to characterize the funding options. Motion made to authorize the Resource WG to work with the State CDO, the State CFO, and appropriate legislative committees to prepare a draft funding recommendation, from OGIC to the 2020 Legislature, for OGIC to review.

During discussion on the motion, Dean suggested that OGIC consider an additional evaluation project that would extend the taxing district boundaries pilot project undertaken by LCOG for OGIC over the past year or so. That project developed a methodology to create all taxing district boundaries for a particular jurisdiction. Dean suggests that we extend that methodology to the entire state as one of the evaluation projects undertaken with the initial funds OGIC will request in the 2020 Session. As Dean indicated, that would provide statewide benefit, and tie other existing data together using the district boundaries. Examples of these boundaries are school districts, fire and police districts, water and sewer districts, urban renewal districts, soil and water conservation districts, etc. Development of these district boundaries statewide and subsequent linkage of these districts boundaries to other data sets would potentially engage and benefit a wide variety of local jurisdictions, state agencies and other organizations. Because of the work done by LCOG to develop the methodology for developing the boundaries from tax lot data available from the County Assessors, it would likely be possible to develop all the taxing district boundaries statewide in the proposed timeframe, between now and the 2020 legislative session.

Kay talked about the last meeting of the ELT group and their priorities. She would like the Resource WG to look for possible alignment between the evaluation projects and the items that came out of the last legislative session and with the Governor's priorities. She indicated that there is a Governor's Disaster Management meeting coming up soon that could present some alignment possibilities. She mentioned that we would need to be mindful about the timing of wildfire projects based on wildfire season. She talked about the Coastal Caucus meeting coming up that could provide an opportunity for networking and finding out about priorities that could guide our evaluation project efforts. She also reminded us that the Chief Financial Office will play an important role in our

effort. She said that it would be a good idea for Kathryn and OGIC members to schedule meetings with legislators and others to advocate for our request during Legislative Days in September, and at other gatherings where appropriate people will be gathered.

Renee posed the question as to how to run this funding request up the chain within the Executive branch before we start talking to legislators. She said her agency has already started working on budget for 2021-23. Jerri said most agencies aren't allowed to take a funding request to the Legislature during the short session. Kay said she thought that Kathryn already has a path to submit a funding request. Jerri questioned whether that path would be submittal of a request from Kathryn or whether the mechanism would actually be something introduced by a legislative committee. More research will be needed to determine the mechanics of the request.

For the purposes of the Resource WG's effort, Jerri mentioned that we will want to be aware of the timing of the spend, since we will have only a few months to make and show significant progress before the 2021 session begins, even though the expenditure will cover the time from the end of the short session to the end of the biennium, a little more than a year. We will also want to confirm the cost for staff with the fact that it will take some time to get people on board. Cy confirmed that the requested positions are full time and are needed to support GEOHub going forward, not for conducting the evaluation projects. He said that the cost for the positions going forward beyond this biennium would be paid by an increase in the state agency assessment. The evaluation projects will be conducted with the help of contractors. Jerri noted that we will need to be as accurate as possible with our cost estimates for the funding request, and able to clearly justify the numbers. She said it has been her experience that if we are told no by the Legislature more than once, the request will be dead for a really long time, so we need to have our facts and figures in good order.

The discussion noted here was primarily intended to guide the work of the Resource WG to develop a draft funding recommendation. Steven indicated that we should make a funding request to the Legislature in the short session as a means of getting started and making progress toward meeting the statutory mandate, that we shouldn't miss the short session as an opportunity to get started. Cy said that it makes sense to do both kinds of evaluation projects discussed in this meeting:

- tsunami/wildfire to show what it takes and what the outcome would be to develop all the necessary data sets for a limited geographic area, set up the workflows for maintenance, and the protocols for standardization and aggregation
- statewide tax district boundaries to show what it takes and what the outcome would be to develop that data, set up the workflows for maintenance, and integrate other data with those district boundaries for certain business purposes.

If we set the expectation properly for the Legislature with this initial funding request, then we can come back in the 2021 Session and say we accomplished those things, then we'll be in a good position to make the next funding request.

Tom talked a bit about the fact that development of the tax district boundaries would go a long way toward convincing the five counties that don't want to share their tax lot data to share it willingly in the future. John W. said the tax district boundaries data set would show the Legislature something that is the direct result of the data sharing legislation they enacted. He said we want to also have an evaluation project or two that has a direct impact on the districts of some of key legislators on the committee we'll be speaking to, such as tsunami for a coastal district if a coastal legislator is on that committee. Having a champion on that committee will be very important.

Motion restated by Jeff, seconded by Dean, motion passed unanimously. Jeff confirmed the Resource WG to consist of Jeff, Dean, Dave, Cy, Patti, Steve, Rachel, Mike Smith...room for more.

Performance Measures Update

Cy walked the Council through a slide presentation about [Objectives and Key Results](#) (OKRs). He described the approach as similar to the agile project management approach, an agile, iterative way to move from planning to execution. The Objectives in this approach are the Goals OGIC already identified during its strategic planning effort. The Council spent about a half hour working through an exercise to identify Key Results for each of the already established five Objectives (Goals). The teams that will be responsible for each of the Key Results will likely be FIT teams, GEO, GPL, PAC, etc. Each of the five teams reported their results at the end of the exercise. Cy will compile the results of the exercise and send out to the Council. The idea is that OGIC will spend a bit of time at each future meeting evaluating the progress and status of each Objective and the Key Results.

Framework Data Development Proposals

Theresa presented the [outcome of the Framework Data Development Proposals](#) to the Council for their review and decision on moving forward. She reviewed in the presentation the background and rationale for the Framework Data Development Program, as well as the proposal review process. The program is currently funded with \$500K each biennium from state agency assessments. Proposals are accepted from public bodies; the process isn't open more widely. In the past few years, there has been a concerted effort by Theresa to move the program to a more structured approach, in anticipation of an accelerated level of investment to complete the initial Framework development statewide.

There were four proposals that were judged by the reviewing teams to merit funding at this point, with three of those needing some adjustments before award. Four other proposals were judged to be deficient in one or more areas and were not recommended for funding at this time. The total amount of proposals judged to be fundable now is \$309,200. Comments made by the reviewing teams for the three proposals to be funded conditionally will be used to modify those proposals. Those modified proposals will then be used as statements of work in interagency or intergovernmental agreements executed between GEO and the proposers to conduct the work.

Motion made and seconded to fund Proposals 1, 2, 4 and 6 as recommended by the reviewing teams (see slide show). Motion passed unanimously.

Four additional proposals were judged not ready for funding, but worthy of additional consideration. Reviewing teams decided to recommend that these four be allowed to be modified based on reviewing team comments. If those proposals can be modified appropriately in a relatively short timeframe previously determined by the reviewing teams, OGIC will be asked at its next meeting to approve expenditures on these projects.

Motion made and seconded to support the process laid out for the other four proposals. Motion passed unanimously. OGIC expressed its appreciation for the work of Theresa, FIT and the reviewing teams for this effort.

OGIC Work Groups and Committees

Theresa presented [a few slides](#) related to the [Framework Implementation Team \(FIT\) Charter](#). She presented changes made recently to the FIT Charter to align better with the statutory authorization for OGIC, to modify the purpose of the FIT, to add two new data theme work groups and to revise the leadership transition process. 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.).

Suggestion made to adjust the meeting schedule in the charter to indicate that group will meet at least bi-annually, but could meet more often. Current language tying to standards forum makes meeting schedule somewhat difficult to interpret. Adjustment should be made to decision-making process so that decisions don't get pushed out indefinitely. Suggestion made to add something that makes explicit the connection between the FIT participant and their agency, to communicate and achieve agency buy-in related to FIT activities and initiatives. Question raised about when to incorporate as-yet-undeveloped process for adding/deleting themes and data elements. Theresa said she would like to include that last item in a procedural document outside the Charter. Theresa will make a few modifications to the FIT Charter as suggested in the meeting and bring it back to the next OGIC meeting, or in the interim by email, for approval and adoption. If voted for approval by Council in between meetings, the decision would have to be ratified, perhaps on a consent agenda, at the next meeting. Motion made to return Charter to FIT for modification and return for approval, motion seconded and approved unanimously.

Cy walked the group through the [PAC Charter](#) next. Similar changes suggested for meeting schedules and decision-making as suggested for FIT charter. Make explicit that the committee only exists to provide policy advice to OGIC, not to take action on their own beyond that. Make explicit that PAC can come up with recommendations to OGIC on their own, not simply as a result of being tasked by OGIC. Some discussion about the appropriate level of participation from various stakeholders. For example, AOC wouldn't likely appoint someone who is a County Commissioner, but should be someone that works in county government who has significant policy experience. PAC members would be appointed by OGIC members, one per OGIC member. Question asked about what PAC products might be. Cy said PAC had worked on various data sharing documents, such as an MOU, a data sharing strategy, and ultimately a draft data sharing statute. Motion made to have a small group, led by Dean and Cy, to make appropriate PAC changes and bring back to OGIC for approval, either at a meeting or in the interim. Motion seconded and approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

Next Meeting

October 2019, TBD