

Geospatial Data Sharing Work Group

Sponsored by the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management & Technology (JLCIMT)
and the State Chief Information Officer (State CIO)

Meeting Notes (Draft)

Date and time of meeting:	April 8, 2016 (10:00 AM - 3:00 PM PST)
Meeting venue:	Commission Room, Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Minutes drafted by:	Cy Smith, State Geospatial Information Officer (State GIO)

1. CALL TO ORDER – Sean McSpaden, JLCIMT Committee Administrator

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:10 am PST. Meeting attendees were:

Volker Mell – Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde	Sean McSpaden - Legislative Fiscal Office
John Waffenschmidt – Lincoln County Surveyor	Jim Rue – DLCD Director, OGIC Chair
Pete Boone – Tualatin Valley Water District	Jerri Bohard – ODOT Trans. Development Manager
Jeff Frkonja – Portland Metro Research Center	Mark Tennyson – Oregon Emergency Management
Eric Brandt – Lane Council of Governments	Renee Davis – OWEB Deputy Director
Tom Rohlfig – Marion County Assessor	Connor Anderson – Acting DOGAMI CIO
Andy Thompson – Corvallis Regional 911 Center	Jerry Martin – Oregon State Police, Dispatch
Jimmy Kagan – PSU Institute for Natural Resources	Graham Slater – Oregon Employment Department
Ken Kato – UO Campus GIS & Mapping	Curtis Cude – OHA Public Health Authority
Molly Vogt – City of Gresham GIS	Travis Miller – Office of State CIO, Policy/Communications
Mike Schrankel – Hood River County GIS	Theresa Burcsu – Office of State CIO, GEO
Cy Smith – Office of State CIO, GEO	

Guests were David Ringeisen, ODOT, and Michael Gurley, OEM

2. WELCOME – Honorable Representative Nancy Nathanson, JLCIMT Co-Chair

The Representative thanked everyone for coming and talked about some of her long-held interests and involvement in geospatial issues. She was a geography major at UO and chaired the IT Committee at the League of Oregon Cities. She has been interested for many years in improving government to government information sharing, efficiency and effectiveness, and emergency response statewide. She believes it is important to ensure that our emergency response connections work instantly, that the needed data to make that happen is in place before an emergency happens. She also indicated that she understands this isn't just about emergency response. It extends to school enrollments, land use planning and most other activities in which government is involved. She expressed her appreciation for the involvement of all the participants in this work group and believes we have the right people in the room to put together a good legislative concept to resolve the data sharing issues between public bodies.

3. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND AGENDA REVIEW – Sean McSpaden

Based on Rep. Nathanson's welcome, Sean mentioned that it's clear we have a partner in this work we'll be doing over the next few months. He thanked the work group for participating and indicated that Alex Pettit, the State CIO and co-sponsor of the work group, also thanks them for participating. Sean indicated that a website has been set up for the group at <http://www.oregon.gov/geo/Pages/data-sharing-workgroup.aspx>. Work group materials and meeting notes will be posted there, along with other documents of interest.

Sean emphasized that a great effort was made to create a diverse work group that is representative of the stakeholder community. There is great interest in the input of all members of the work group in order to get a good idea of the issues and concerns that exist and the approaches needed to solve them. There was also an intentional effort to get diversity in the work group relative to expertise.

Sean highlighted that the primary purpose of the work group is to develop a revised legislative concept between April and November 2016 that the stakeholder community supports regarding geospatial Framework data sharing between public bodies. The reason for the compressed timeframe for the work group activities is to complete the legislative concept prior to filing deadlines for the 2017 Legislative Session.

Sean mentioned that the work group roster was nearly complete with just a few additional members required at this time. The work group needs a member focused on Education. It will also require DOJ involvement to provide advice and counsel to the work group around the concepts of data custodianship, authoritative data and sources, privacy, and liability, at a minimum. If there are other missing stakeholders or expertise, work group members are encouraged to contact Sean or Cy.

4. MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS – All

During this portion of the meeting, each member of the work group was asked to give their name, affiliation and stakeholder group they're representing, and some brief comments about what they hope to accomplish and/or issues they hope to resolve via participation in the work group.

Jeff Frkonja, Metro Research Center Director – Metro serves internal and external clients. They are a data aggregator and standardizer. They play a regional role similar to GEO's statewide role, for about 25 cities and districts. They want to see data sharing success in general and a sustained business model that supports such data sharing. They hope the legislative concept will optimize the process for standardization and data sharing, increasing efficiencies and sustaining the business models for all stakeholders.

Mark Tennyson, OEM Technology and Response Section Manager – They have issues getting and sharing data within the PSAP (911 Centers) program. They have a number of data sharing agreements with PSAPs that limit use and sharing of the data. They'd like to see agreement that the data is for shared use by public bodies in all areas of government.

Mike Schrankel, Hood River County Community Development GIS Coordinator – They are representative of a number of small counties and communities. They would like to see some sort of formal agreement for sharing data across agencies and organizations.

Curtis Cude, Oregon Health Authority's Environmental Public Health Program Manager – They manage a number of public health programs. They've brought together a number of key data sets from other sources related to environmental hazards to human health. They analyze the data and provide information to decision makers. Data stewardship is very important to them.

Jim Rue, Department of Land Conservation & Development Director – The Oregon land use planning system is dependent on the work of local governments, and data sharing is important on a daily basis. In addition, the Executive branch of state government is beginning an effort to break down the silos within state government that limit data sharing and collaborative effort to solve problems. Examples thus far have included multi-agency shared services initiatives around accounting, payroll, human resources, etc. A GIS shared services initiative is about to begin. A key effort in the initial GIS shared services approach will likely involve development of a dynamic model of the Oregon economy, showing where people are getting jobs, leaving jobs, needing and using government services, etc. Such a model will help state government focus state services in areas that need it the most.

Renee Davis, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Deputy Director – They focus on conservation and restoration of watersheds, and manage a GIS program that assists in those efforts. They are familiar with data sharing issues. They have to integrate a lot of data to assess the effectiveness of their investments. They are very sensitive to data confidentiality because their client base is comprised largely of private volunteers.

Ken Kato, University of Oregon Campus GIS & Mapping Director – They run the GIS and spatial systems on campus. They focus a lot of emergency response and preparedness on campus to maintain public safety. They will host another Olympic Trials in a few months in which their work will be extremely important. They have worked with their general counsel to develop protections for themselves and their data so that it doesn't all have to be divulged publicly. They are very familiar with the inefficiencies involved in dealing with data sharing and would like to see improvements.

Eric Brandt, Lane Council of Governments RLID/GIS Services Program Manager – LCOG is similar to Metro in some ways. They are data aggregators, but they also create data. They are a voluntary association of local governments in Lane County. LCOG is a regional planning, coordination, program development, and service-delivery organization that currently serves 29 members. They were one of the first government agencies in the state to use GIS. They are very interested in seeing data flow efficiently between government agencies. They have the private sector plugged into their organization as users and contributors to the RLID geospatial data system, which is a fairly unique situation. They would like to be able to bring data from other government organizations into their system for the use of their partners.

Jerri Bohard, ODOT Transportation Development Division Administrator – TDD is ODOT's planning organization. They're looking to improve efficiencies in the division. Data is seen as a corporate asset, critical to the agency's work. The work they do in the division takes a lot of time and resources. The number one job of the agency is emergency response. The division's information is relied upon for emergency response across the agency.

Molly Vogt, City of Gresham GIS Manager – Molly is also on the National Geospatial Advisory Committee for the FGDC and serves as the President of the Oregon Chapter of URISA, an international geospatial professional association. At the City, they are focused on improving and enhancing their decision-making capacity, which requires high quality, reliable data. They are interested in building and enhancing the ways they build and maintain data. They recognize the value of this data sharing initiative and appreciate the opportunity to build relationships and reduce risk aversion to get things done in this regard.

Connor Anderson, Dept. of Geology & Mineral Industries Acting CIO (sitting in for Holly Mercer, Deputy Director) – They provide many data products related to natural hazards and the geology of the state. They recently underwent an IT assessment, including data management and storage. They store and maintain about 1/6 as much data as the Dept. of Human Services and the Oregon Health Authority combined. Access to their data is essential to many business processes at all levels of government.

Jimmy Kagan, PSU Institute for Natural Resources (INR) Director – Jimmy works for PSU and OSU, with the Institute located in both. INR was created to bring together natural resources data from multiple sources for use by all levels of Oregon government. They are highly interested in efficiencies that can come from sharing data. They are a data creator and steward of some data sets (e.g., invasive species). They understand the necessary balance between data creation, stewardship, analysis and resources.

Pete Boone, Tualatin Valley Water District Engineer and Surveyor – Pete is representing the Special Districts Association, comprised of over 1,000 special districts. In a public utility role, they focus on data reliability, confidentiality, and security. They don't value bad data, it can cause poor investments and bad decisions. From their perspective, no data is better than bad data.

John Waffenschmidt, Lincoln County Surveyor and IT Director – John is representing the Association of Oregon Counties, which represents County Commissioners and has several associate organizations. They want to make sure the needs of all the stakeholders are represented in this process.

Jerry Martin, Oregon State Police Dispatch Support/Applications Team – They have been using spatial data for a long time as a data consumer and did some data creation in the past. They have made some headway integrating Computer Aided Dispatch systems to help dispatch emergency vehicles across county lines. They want to improve dispatch operator systems and break down barriers to sharing. Security concerns are also of interest.

Tom Rohlfling, Marion County Assessor – Tom is representing the Oregon State Association of County Assessors. They maintain the tax lot layer in each county, as well as ownership and valuation data. They are concerned about costs for sharing data, the size of the data sets to be shared in terms of number of records, and data confidentiality in relation to data sharing. Data security is also a concern.

Graham Slater, Oregon Employment Dept's Workforce & Economic Research Division Administrator – They geocode every business as part of the workforce program. They keep track of employed and unemployed people. They used to have a child care program and tracked sex offenders in relation to school locations. They use GIS to guide need for services and placement of Employment offices. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is the analogous federal agency. Their federal counterpart provides some funding and they work closely with them. They have offered improvements to statutes to improve confidentiality. They want to help their clients make better choices.

Volker Mell, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde GIS Coordinator – Tribal GIS capacity varies from tribe to tribe. They are data consumers from many sources. It is sometimes challenging to find needed data, so data may be created and even duplicated if it can't be found or accessed. Their attorneys sometimes advise against entering data sharing agreements.

Andy Thompson, Corvallis Regional Communications Center Public Safety Dispatch Administrator – Andy represents the Oregon Public Safety Answering Point (911 Center) community. They maintain street centerlines and are looking to increase efficiencies across county and city boundaries.

5. BACKGROUND – Sean, Cy, and David Ringeisen

Sean presented slides with a historical background about geospatial data sharing efforts in Oregon over the last 15-20 years. It is posted here:

<http://www.oregon.gov/geo/Data%20Sharing%20Workgroup/DSWG%20Talking%20Points%20040816.pdf>

Cy and Dave presented slides that indicated some of the issues that have come up with regard to data sharing and illustrated how Framework data has been defined through the collaborative governance structure of the Oregon Geographic Information Council. It is posted here:

<http://www.oregon.gov/geo/Data%20Sharing%20Workgroup/Data%20Access%20Issues%202016.pdf>

6. Facilitated Discussion – All

Cy led a facilitated discussion to identify data sharing problems, concerns and possible solutions. The notes presented here are the raw notes. Cy will be working to synthesize the raw notes and will present that synthesis at or before the next Work Group meeting.

Problems

1. If folks don't come to me for data, I may lose funds or recognition
2. State doesn't provide sufficient funds to develop standardized data
3. Govt. agencies operate inefficiently now, some do things they shouldn't regarding data development
4. There may be legal barriers to data sharing that we aren't aware of
5. Process for data sharing isn't well defined
6. Legal language in data sharing agreements difficult to manage for multiple jurisdictions
7. Hard to determine whom to contact for any given data set
8. Can't always wait for the right entity to develop authoritative data
9. Right data to solve specific problem doesn't always exist
10. Aggregating data from multiple sources may change data sharing restrictions

11. No collective approach to create incentives for Framework data development
12. Sharing critical infrastructure data causes security concerns and issues
13. Where should the central data clearinghouse reside?
14. Some of the source legislative concept was lost during translation to legal language for the 2016 bill

Concerns

1. Redacting elements that can't be shared causes technological challenges and confidentiality issues
2. There's not enough money allocated now to pay for all the needed Framework data
3. Benefits from standardization are asymmetric, the State receives more benefits than local government or other data providers (there's an opportunity here to make benefits more symmetric)
4. There are often multiple data sets that more or less appropriate for a particular purpose (dueling data)
5. Overly restrictive sharing and redistribution process can cause some not to share
6. We often use the terms 'they' and 'we' without defining the entities or the audiences
7. Telling people to create more data than they need for their own purposes will likely fail
8. Should we identify some data that is standardized but not authoritative? Would that be useful?
9. What is the status quo alternative? It is often helpful to identify that for the broader community
10. Bad data can cause improper investment by government agencies
11. It's not clear to local entities how their perspectives will be represented in this process. Who decides what Framework data will be shared? Who decides what the process will look like?
12. Timeframe for this process is very compressed; we should keep it simple
13. Legislative legal counsel may not sufficiently understand the details. Need to be involved in the process of drafting the next legislative concept as early as possible.

Solutions

1. Identify the opportunities and incentives for participation
2. Everyone who participates will have access to the whole data set
3. Provide funding, perhaps through a competitive process
4. Storing/hosting data through the Oregon Spatial Data Library could defray provider costs (symmetry)
5. Responding to data requests from one place is beneficial to all (symmetry)
6. Single authoritative data set is solvable
7. We could identify a more minimal Framework data set (Framework lite)
8. Have authoritative source create the authoritative data; enable/help them to do this when needed
9. Provide authoritative data back to source, branded to them so they can show benefit of participation
10. Provide products back to the data sources in terms of value-added summaries/aggregations
11. Unanticipated uses of data could be valuable, we should keep track of these
12. Establish OGIC as a statutory body; OGIC would define Framework through collaborative process
13. Establish a list of authoritative data sets and their sources
14. Develop a list of legal questions for Legislative Legal Counsel and DOJ; ensure that the Work Group works on actual bill language, not just the legislative concept, to avoid 'lost in translation' problems
15. Preserve ability to use intergovernmental agreements to address unique data sharing issues
16. We are basically defining mutual aid conditions for normal situations, similar to that for emergencies
17. We need to focus on something tangible and doable given time constraints
18. We need to write a draft bill that includes layman's explanation to make legislative impacts and benefits clear to the stakeholders

7. Next Steps – Sean and Cy

Form sub-groups to:

1. Begin drafting the revised legislative concept, at least in outline form, for the May 20 meeting
2. Outline a Work Group communication strategy for the stakeholder community
3. Explore funding needs, sources, and models for data development, standardization and sharing

Sub-group(s) logistics:

- Would meet a couple times before May 20 meeting of Work Group

- Each sub-group would have 3-5 people from the larger Work Group
- Sub-group(s) will prepare materials for review by the Work Group

Sean confirmed that the JLCIMT is expected to meet in May, September and December of 2016 and, at this point, expects the JLCIMT membership to be stable. Sean will research the potential future composition of the JLCIMT in the 2017 session.

Proposed agenda items for next Work Group meeting:

- Communication strategy
- Draft LC and any legal interpretations from DOJ
- Synthesis of facilitated discussion outcomes
- Funding needs, sources and models – for possible inclusion in a fiscal impact assessment for the LC

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00pm PST.