

RECAP

Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date: July 29, 2021
Time: 12:00pm – 3:30pm
Location: Virtual, per EO 20-03 and EO 20-12

Member Attendees: Tom Rohlring, Marion County Assessor (Vice Chair); Jeff Frkonja, Regional Government; Colleen Miller, City of Bend; Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Carrie Pak, Tualatin Valley Water District; Maylian Pak, Oregon Community Foundation; Lisa Gaines, OSU Institute for Natural Resources; Brenda Bateman, Business Oregon; Marguarite Becenti, Umatilla Tribes; Patti Sauers, Yamhill Communications; Dave Stuckey, Oregon Military Department; Brad Cross, Wasco County Surveyor; Molly Earle, Gartrell Group

Staff/Observers: Kathryn Helms, EIS-Chief Data Officer; Cy Smith, GEO; Terri Morganson, Esri; John Ruffing, Esri; Bob Harmon, OWRD; Don Pettit, DEQ; Jacob Lubman, EIS-DGT; Myrica McCune, OSU-INR; Nikki Hart-Brinkley, RVCOG; Stacy Schumacher, Umatilla Tribes; Chris Wright, ODOT; Cedric Cooney, ODFW; Phil McClellan, DOR; Rebecca Hall, DOR; Brady Callahan, OPRD; Thom York, DOR; Adrian Laufer, DLCD; John Stroud, Timmons Group; Joe Severson, State Marine Board; Phil Smith, ODOT

Introductions & Announcements

- Meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Tom Rohlring at 12:00pm. With 11 of the 17 voting [OGIC members](#) present, and under modified procedures per Executive Order, a quorum was established for conducting business virtually and taking votes.
- No additions to the [agenda](#) were made. It was noted that the OGIC meetings for the remainder of the calendar year have been set and invitations extended to OGIC members.
- [Minutes](#) from the April meeting were approved without change from the latest posted draft.
- Consent Agenda included two items: [Shoreline Data Exchange Standard](#) and [Shoreline Stewardship Plan](#). The Consent Agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

CDO Legislative and Organizational Update

Kathryn Helms, State CDO, gave a [presentation](#) that provides a legislative and organizational update. She pointed to Oregon's Data Strategy for 2021-23 and provided a brief summary. She talked about the Data Strategy Actions that have been taken, are ongoing, and those that are planned. She summarized the CDO budget package submitted in coordination with OGIC and identified the elements that were approved, including approximately \$3M for the Geospatial Data Management and Sharing project that will create the infrastructure foundation for GEOHub, the secure portal for public bodies to share geospatial Framework data with each other. The budget package also includes approximately \$1M for data integration tools, and funds to support hiring 7 full time staff. She showed

an organizational design chart. And she indicated that her office is currently at 30% capacity, and that planning for the next biennium has already begun across state government.

GDMS Steering Committee Discussion

Brenda Bateman discussed the activities of the GDMS Steering Committee. She indicated that they had met a couple of times, but that they were stuck and needed some guidance from OGIC. They are questioning where they fit in the overall governance structure and whether there is any overlap between what they are doing and what other OGIC committees or work groups are doing. A draft diagram from page 5 of the draft [Steering Committee](#) charter was shared and discussed. The GDMS Project Manager produced the first draft of the charter and had made an attempt to create an organizational chart to reflect where the GDMS Steering Committee fits in relationship to other existing OGIC groups.

As indicated in the draft charter, the GDMS Steering Committee exists to “advise [the Executive Sponsor] on strategic direction, communicate unified expectations, and provide assistance on resolution of significant project risks.” After some brief discussion, Brenda suggested kicking the charter back to staff for further consideration of the organizational diagram and relationships. Jeff commented on the original thinking regarding the GDMS Steering Committee creation, that GDMS is a programmatic activity that needs a steering committee for advice and guidance to ensure that it meets the objectives and needs of the many stakeholders represented by OGIC, and that the steering committee might call upon the standing operational committees of OGIC on particular matters, such as the Policy Advisory Committee for policy questions or the Technical Advisory Committee for technical questions.

Brandt suggested that staff produce a more holistic diagram. Kathryn suggested that OGIC has far too many work groups, committees, etc., and that was creating confusion and potential gridlock related to her authority to manage the GDMS program that is within her portfolio. Cy indicated that the Resource Working Group isn't a necessary construct anymore. The two pieces of the Resource Working Group, the GDMS Steering Committee and the Engagement Team, exist as separate bodies. There are no people assigned to the Resource Working Group now, as there were in the past, and no reason to assign people or resources to that group.

Framework Rules Process – PAC Recommendation

Cy walked the Council through a [presentation](#) on OGIC's statutory responsibilities related to establishing rules for Framework data sharing and management. The Council has the exclusive power to establish rules that identify [Framework data](#) that public bodies must share with each other. There are 16 themes of data, with about 250 data elements within those 16 themes, that have been considered Framework for almost 20 years. There is wide variability in theme maturity. ORS 276A.500-515 says that OGIC is expected to codify by rule the identification of Framework data, as well as recommending an allocation of responsibilities for which public bodies are supposed to collect, use, manage, etc., Framework data, and devising terms under which public bodies share Framework data.

The intent of the Legislature, through their statutory direction, is that the Council should formalize and codify by rule the management of Framework data to make that data more useful for all public bodies. The effect should be to increase the maturity of the Framework themes, and to establish an enterprise approach to the management of Framework data across all public bodies, as opposed to the siloed approach that tends to be the case now. In order to accomplish formalization, administrative rules will need to be established, and then supported by policies, standards and procedures to lay out the details of Framework data governance.

The PAC was asked at the April meeting to come back with a recommendation on how to proceed. Cy presented the PAC recommendation in the presentation. The PAC recommendation is to draft an Oregon Administrative Rule that states:

1. OGIC will establish a list of Framework data elements
2. Framework list will be affirmed and updated annually as needed
3. Data standards will be adopted, list will be updated annually as needed
4. Update frequency will be set for each data element and updated as needed
5. Allocation of responsibilities will be established for each data element
6. Terms of data sharing will be set for each data element

Phil McClellan from DOR asked how the recommendation and path forward would impact existing data sharing agreements, like the many slightly different agreements that DOR uses related to tax lot data sharing between counties and state agencies. The specific question was whether the recommended path forward would take the place of those existing agreements. Cy said he thought that could be the case. Phil asked a follow up question about whether counties would be expected, in the future, to provide tax lot data in a standardized format rather than whatever format in which they currently maintain the data. Cy indicated that, until/unless the Legislature provides additional funding, counties would only be expected to provide data in their existing format. He also indicated that it would be a good idea for OGIC to work with DOR to determine what data sharing agreements should contain. The first step is to establish a rule that indicates OGIC will be exercising its authority to determine the details that will govern data sharing around Framework data.

Jeff reminded the Council that some jurisdictions derive revenue from data sales. He said we should take that into account as we move forward to determine the details around data sharing.

Kathryn said she didn't understand why we need an administrative rule. She said if public bodies don't have resources to comply, the rules won't matter. She thinks OGIC could simply create the processes and policies without rules. Cy indicated that the legislation doesn't have enough detail to drive the making of processes and policies. He said that the reason for an OAR is that it has authority over all public bodies, whereas OGIC policies and processes without an OAR would not have authority over all public bodies. Carrie Pak said that the PAC recognized that we have tried policies and processes for many years with limited success, so we need to take the next step which is to follow up the statute with an administrative rule to provide the detail that the statute doesn't provide on its own. Brandt

mentioned that LCOG and its partners derive considerable income from data sales and wants to make sure OGIC takes that into account as it moves forward. Tom said even if we have an OAR, we won't be able to get widespread compliance if we don't have funding to offer for those that will lose revenue.

Jeff asked what the alternative would be if we don't move forward without an OAR. Kathryn said OGIC should develop the processes and policies in the PAC recommendation, urge compliance, measure compliance and then move forward with an OAR if there's not enough compliance. Colleen asked what tools Kathryn uses to get compliance on the Open Data Strategy. Kathryn said she created a standard to lay out the process for state agencies and then documents who is and isn't in compliance. There's not a stick if an agency doesn't comply. Cy reminded OGIC that the difference between the Open Data Strategy and the OGIC statute is that OGIC's authority extends to all public bodies, not just the executive branch of state government.

Jeff made a motion that OGIC amend PAC's recommendation to set aside for now the drafting of an administrative rule and just move forward with the tactical steps 1-4 listed in the PAC recommendation, monitor compliance, and report back to the Council at some interval, at which point a decision could be made about whether to move forward with an OAR. Patti seconded. Cy mentioned that there are two other steps and suggested Jeff add step 5. He agreed, but Patti wouldn't agree to second the revised motion. Jeff then withdrew his motion. Patti said she was concerned with step 5 because it seemed like too much, she felt like OGIC should try to move forward with steps 1-4 first, as they appeared to be easier to accomplish. Brandt said he thought an OAR would eventually be required, but that he liked the pragmatic approach initially.

Carrie asked who would be doing the work laid out in steps 1-4. She said she was concerned about how the work would get done with Kathryn's office being without staff. Cy answered that PAC would lead on the work, GEO staff would help with the work, but that most of the work would actually be done by Framework Implementation Teams. PAC will engage those teams, staff will help with documenting. Kathryn said that she wasn't sure that new staff she will hire going forward will agree that this is the right direction, and that regardless she won't prioritize it for her staff in this calendar year. Molly suggested that we table the recommendation for now.

Carrie said that based on Kathryn's comment that this isn't a priority, she wanted to know what Kathryn's priorities are. Kathryn said that much of OGIC's mandate calls for coordination with the State CIO, but that OGIC is only a small part of her strategic priorities, so she is often in a position of watching OGIC take on something that requires her staff to complete that isn't part of her strategic priority. She went on to mention that her priorities include the State Data Strategy and the Open Data Strategy. Those things include the top 10-15 actions in her portfolio. She thinks the Framework program needs to be revitalized, but she has to make sure her entire portfolio is balanced appropriately. Carrie said that she comes to the Council as a volunteer and that it's disappointing to hear that the Council's recommendations and feedback aren't supported by the State CDO.

Jeff asked if the CDO has capacity for anything in steps 1-4 or not. Kathryn says her office can handle some of the work, but not if it entails establishing an OAR. Cy suggested that step 1 of the PAC recommendation is something that could be undertaken with the FIT teams and would likely take the rest of the calendar year. That would mean that steps 1-3 would be feasible, and possibly step 4. Brandt made a motion that the PAC move forward with steps 1-3, minus the OAR. Molly seconded. Motion unanimously approved.

OKR Status and Recommendations

Cy and Molly indicated that the OKR status was the same as last meeting, that there had been no progress made, mostly due to lack of staff resources at GEO. They recommended that the next six month cycle begin at the October meeting and that the Performance Management Work Group would come back at that meeting with a recommendation for the next cycle.

Myrica McCune gave a presentation on the TAC OKRs. Their cycle began at the January OGIC meeting and ended at the July OGIC meeting. The TAC OKRs and status for the past six months are:

Objective – Increase Participation in Framework Program

Key Result 1 – Create a network of GIS practitioners

- Tom Elder and Cy Smith coordinated, designed and distributed a survey of GIS practitioners as an initial census of the GIS community across the state for OGIC internal use (277 respondents as of 7/28/21)

Key Result 2 – Increase FIT participation from X to Y

- Identification of X: Audit of 11 listservs have an initial count $X > 355$
- Next steps to refine initial count, remove duplicates and known obsolete contacts, add contacts from FITS operating without listservs (Transportation, Cadastral, Address). Estimate that X will be closer to 400 when this is complete.
- $Y = X + 10\%$

The TAC OKRs for the next six months, from the July 2021 – December 2021 are:

Objective – Increase Participation in Framework Program

Key Result 1 – Create a one page communication document outlining benefits and importance of participation in the Framework program

Key Result 2 – Increase FIT participation from ~355 to 390 (+10%)

Key Result 3 – Increase survey respondents from 277 to 415 (+50%)

Key Result 4 – Refine baseline metric for number of participants in the Framework program

Objective – Mitigate Barriers to Data Sharing

Key Result 1 – Survey local road authorities to identify the most common reasons data are not shared

Key Result 2 – Create a storymap that highlights use cases that demonstrate the utility of data sharing, and includes the statutory language around data sharing liability

Joe Severson, GPL Chair from OSMB, spoke about the GPL OKRs. He said that Daniel Stoelb has been leading on a Key Result to develop a standard operating procedure that will organize and coordinate the GIS community in support of the emergency response community during disasters like the wildfires that occurred last year. The draft SOP is being used to some extent to assist with the 2021 wildfires. The second Key Result they're working on is to develop a list of GIS contacts for emergency response. That list is complete and will be updated annually in March. Another Key Result they're pursuing is a series of templates for data collection, damage assessment and others. And finally, they have a Key Result aimed at having a table top exercise using the SOP in October. GPL meets about their OKRs regularly and coordinates with the TAC.

Sustainable Funding Approach

Cy provided background for this discussion. He indicated that this agenda item is an opportunity for OGIC to discuss how to establish sustainable funding to achieve OGIC's vision, which is to develop Framework data consistently everywhere in the state in order to support the consistent provision of government services. The statutory reference says that OGIC will recommend to the Legislature ways to eliminate public bodies charging each other for Framework data. They do this because they're trying to support the development of Framework data they need to provide consistent government services. The recommendation OGIC made in this regard in the 2019 session was well received, but didn't have unanimous support and didn't result in sustainable funding.

Tom said he thought part of the work needed to determine what needs to be funded and how much is needed is Steps 1-4 discussed in an earlier agenda item. Cy reminded OGIC that we did some preliminary work along those lines in 2018 leading to our recommendation to the Legislature in 2019.

Jeff said that we need to think about two things, one being how much funding is needed and the other being how to achieve the vision programmatically. He said he has heard from others that the funding number we presented last session was too large and intimidating. He recommended that the work the Council commissioned of the PAC earlier in this meeting to determine a new funding recommendation. He reminded OGIC that there have been a number of possible funding mechanisms identified, including tapping a portion of existing fees, public-private partnerships, and public bonds. Some of that earlier discussion and work could possibly be resurrected and be useful.

Kathryn indicated that she thinks a model for OGIC should be the [York Info Partnership](#) that presented to OGIC a few months ago. She said the timeline needs to be very long, that we shouldn't be trying to come up with ways to fund local governments to incentivize them to participate. We should just move forward with those who want to participate without additional funding. She said OGIC should help her design what a sustainable funding approach should look like...perhaps a steadily increasing grant program for Framework data along the lines of the existing Framework grant program. She said the best approach may be to start preparing for another funding request in 2025, not 2023.

Jeff elaborated a bit on the York Info Partnership example. He said a project he's working on as a consultant in Alaska for their DOT related to data aggregation and they've spent 4 person weeks. That is an indication why the funding OGIC recommended in 2019 was so high. That cost in Alaska represented an investment that wasn't made elsewhere. The costs that OGIC estimated in 2019 didn't represent all the funds that are spent on Framework, just the amount that is needed to fill in the gaps where investments are being made. Someone is going to have to pay more to solve the problem identified in OGIC's vision.

Cy mentioned that we weren't asking the Legislature to pay for OGIC's vision with an appropriation, we had identified a way to generate funds in other ways, but we needed the Legislature's help to make it happen. There are undoubtedly other mechanisms. Tom indicated that we have to get to a point where we're making data sharing happen, as envisioned by the legislation. He said putting that off beyond 2023 would be a problem. He reminded us that Rep. Nathanson initiated this in 2015 and we still haven't managed to make it happen. Jeff reminded us that looking for money will take a significant lift. We have to acknowledge that we're going to be asking people to pay and that's not an easy discussion to have. Brandt likened what we're doing to creating infrastructure and said we may need to talk about new funding to accomplish it.

Engagement Team

Jeff started by saying that the Engagement Team was successful at helping to get the POP funding in the 2021 session. The Engagement Team work with a number of stakeholders in this effort, including legislators and the stakeholders for the GDMS projects (wildfire, elections, and workforce). Jeff put the question to OGIC about whether the Engagement Team should be dissolved now and allow the GDMS Steering Committee to reconstitute it if needed later, OR let the current team convene again and see if the programmatic work around GDMS needs any assistance. Jeff recommended that we keep the group constituted as is but going on hiatus, and wait to see if it needs to be triggered by GDMS or for other purposes.

Tom said he thought we could perhaps pull others into the Engagement Team as needed for particular purposes. Colleen agreed with Tom's thoughts. Jeff made a motion to dissolve the Engagement Team and let the GDMS Steering Committee decide if they want to reconstitute it. Colleen seconded, motion passed unanimously.

Engagement Team

Phil Smith provided a brief overview of recent TAC activities. Myrica McCune took over as Chair and Chris Zeitner as Vice Chair at the June TAC meeting, for one year. At the June meeting, Cy solicited some participation by TAC in the FIT grant process. TAC worked on their OKRs at the June meeting, as well. And finally, they discussed how best to coordinate with GPL in support of OGIC. Some opportunities would be to have joint OKR work group meetings and to strengthen the roundtable discussions at the joint TAC/GPL meetings. Thanks for Phil Smith for getting TAC off on the right foot as the first Chair.

Joe Severson provided some updates on GPL activities in the last quarter. GPL met with the Preparedness Framework Implementation Team to work on an [after action report](#) related to the 2020 wildfires and other significant events during the last year. DLCD reported to GPL on the Shoreline Data Standard and Stewardship Plan for their review and feedback.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20pm

Next Meeting - October 21, 2021