

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:	August 12, 2016 (10:00 AM - 2:00 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:

Pete Boone – Tualatin Valley Water District	Sean McSpaden - Legislative Fiscal Office
Jeff Frkonja – Portland Metro Research Center	Mark Tennyson – Oregon Emergency Management
Eric Brandt – Lane Council of Governments	Ian Madin – DOGAMI Chief Scientist
Tom Rohlfig – Marion County Assessor	John Waffenschmidt – Lincoln County Surveyor
Ken Kato – UO Campus GIS & Mapping	Jerri Bohard – ODOT, Transportation Devt. Division
Molly Vogt – City of Gresham GIS	Jimmy Kagan – PSU Institute for Natural Resources
Andy Thompson – Corvallis RCC Dispatch	Jes Mendez – Oregon Employment Department
Curtis Cude – OHA Public Health	Jerry Martin – State Police
Cy Smith – Office of State CIO, GEO	Theresa Burcsu – Office of State CIO, GEO
Erin Doyle – League of Oregon Cities	

Guests were Michael Gurley, OEM; Rebecca Gladstone, League of Women Voters; Frank Stratton, SDAO; Mark Landauer, SDAO; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT

There were no changes suggested to the meeting notes for the June meeting. The notes were adopted.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARY DATA PRESENTATIONS

Pete Boone, Frank Stratton, and Mark Landauer with the Special Districts Association of Oregon (SDAO) made a presentation about special districts. The presentation is posted to the Geospatial Data Sharing Work Group (DSWG) website.

Some of the points made about special districts, beyond what is on the slides, included:

- Fire districts are the most prevalent, but there are lots of others...even a predator control district
- Not all special districts are members of the SDAO...approx. 95% are members
- SDAO has a self-insured trust that benefits special districts
- A lot of the work that takes place in special districts is volunteer effort
- Special districts have the same statutory authority as cities and counties
- Special districts provide services that counties generally don't or can't (sewer, water, fire, etc.)
- Originally all special districts were outside of cities, but now some special districts provide some services within municipal boundaries by agreement with cities
- Cities, counties and special districts work together in many cases now to provide efficient service
- Some cities join together to work with a special district for some services (e.g., Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue)
- Elections are administered by the County Clerk; taxes are collected by the County Assessor
- Many small districts don't manage or store any geospatial data and some can't even find maps of their area
- County Clerks are responsible for keeping information about special district boundaries and about elected officials within those districts

- There are slides showing the authorities that are maintained by the State, counties, and cities related to special districts
- Citizens initiate the formation of a special district, but counties administer a hearing process and approve or disapprove the formation of a district
- Special districts don't always follow tax lot boundaries, but most do
- For multi-county districts, the principal County should have records of boundaries, etc.
- Water districts form more often than any other lately, followed by fire and public library districts
- School districts aren't members of SDAO, but SDAO administers a self-insured trust through which they insure all member districts; School Boards Association contracts for that insurance
- SDAO has address information for all schools as a result of providing that insurance, but the schools haven't yet agreed to allow that address data to be shared with other public bodies
- Special districts and cities sometimes have a bit of a contentious relationship during annexations
- Some county service districts are formed by counties and are considered special districts
- Sean mentioned that the State has traditionally tracked about 1000 school buildings, but SDAO insures over 6000 school buildings; that data disparity, and others like it, is problematic for all public bodies
- Cy mentioned that there are a number of state agencies that need information about schools and keep some, but not all, such information; there is considerable duplication of effort on schools
- Jerry Martin mentioned that there is a need to link floor plan data for all schools to the address data

Rebecca Gladstone made the following points, beyond what is in the slides on the website:

- Primary objective is to improve information about elections, particularly candidate information
- Want people to get voter resource information and voter resource guides
- The League of Women Voters (LWV) works in each election gathering information from many sources to produce non-partisan voter guides that contain information about ballot measures and candidates
- The web version of elections information differs considerably from jurisdiction to jurisdiction
- Some County Clerks feel like they have to guess who is running for some special district elections
- Much of the voter guide information is gathered from the highly variable County web pages
- The election process is messy and the information about that process is even messier
- Some of the information is on the web as PDF files that have been scanned (unsearchable)
- Some of the information is not available at all
- LWV would like to see a centralized web-based location where election information could be posted by Clerks
- Standardized templates would help Clerks capture and post information that is useful to citizens
- There's also a problem finding information about who has won elections & successful measures
- LWV would like to be a partner in continuously improving the process
- LWV website has about 7000 elected officials listed by jurisdiction or district
- Demonstrated their [Who Represents You website](#), at Oregon Elected Officials link, where user can enter address and see many of the elected officials for that address; doesn't have all the data
- Website doesn't use GIS and boundaries to determine elected official for given address; volunteers made phone calls to Clerks and others to determine elected officials for addresses
- LWV wants to share information they've collected, but needs a sustainable process going forward
- Cy mentioned that GEO has been evaluating the work and level of effort required to develop a complete, sustainable website that would provide elected officials and other useful election information for any given address; it's an enormous task

3. DRAFT LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT

Sean summarized the work that has been done to revise the [draft legislative concept](#) (LC) based on comments received from ODOT, Metro, Employment Dept., and SDAO. The version reviewed here is v0.8. The draft LC is 95% the same as the last version that was distributed at the last DSWG meeting. He

walked through the specific changes. In the Summary section of the draft LC, Sean said language was removed referencing exemptions from fees, based on changes made later in the document.

Changes made in Section 1, Definitions to clarify that draft LC is specifically and solely related to geospatial data.

Changes made in Section 2. (1) narrow and sharpen OGIC's role slightly and clarify the purpose of the Strategic Plan for Geographic Information Management. This change more closely emulates what OGIC agreed to in the recent revision of their proposed Executive Order.

Change made in Section 2. (1)(b)(R) to indicate that the proposed OGIC member for Economic and Community Development include Employment.

Question was asked about how decisions will be made by council, whether it will be by majority of members, majority of members present, consensus, etc. The draft LC currently says decisions will be made by majority of members, but we will consider changing this to majority of members present. Language now emulates SIEC statutory language. Council will further define working rules in charter. This language is in Section 2. (3) of the LC draft now. Email votes could enable majority decision-making, but the council will be a public body that has to follow public meeting rules, which makes email voting problematic.

Question raised about the value of legislators on the council. Point made about wanting a way to keep Legislature in the loop on council activities. Legislators would be non-voting members and might not participate at every meeting. We'll consider whether to keep them on the council.

Change made in Section 3. (1)(a) to sharpen the council's coordination role related to geographic data, removing language regarding geographic information management and GIS. This also broadened the council's role beyond Framework to include all geospatial data. Council would charter Framework implementation teams.

Change made in Section 3. (1)(f) to match change made in Section 3. (1)(a).

Added "reduce duplication" to Section 3. (2)(b) as part of goals of council.

Added language in Section 3. (2)(e) to be consistent with later language related to delaying implementation of Section 4, particularly regarding elimination of fees charged by a public body to another public body for providing geospatial Framework data.

Question raised about whether the draft LC would mandate that local governments and others would collect or create geospatial Framework data that is currently missing. That is not the intent of the LC, and the language that says public bodies will share geospatial Framework data when at no additional cost or reallocation of resources, is intended to indicate that there is no mandate to expend additional resources to collect or create data, or to standardize data. However, we will look at the language to determine whether more clarity is needed to prevent future misinterpretation. That sort of unfunded mandate is the opposite of what we've discussed together and is not intended within the draft LC.

Question and concern raised about Section 3. (1)(h), suggesting that the language seems like an overreach for the council, potentially interfering with the work of public bodies to meet their missions. The intent of the language is to codify the coordination role of the council, as it currently exists in Executive Order. We will modify this subsection to ensure that it isn't interpreted as the council's role to provide oversight for agency or public body GIS activities. At a minimum, we will add language to clarify the reason for the council's review of public bodies' strategic plans, grant proposals, and budget requests as stated in the current language. Point made that such a review, if done properly, can be the basis for justifying plans, proposals and requests to the State CIO and the Legislature. We need to find the middle ground between those two points of view as we clarify the meaning of this subsection.

Removed language regarding fees in Section 4. (4)(f). The intent is to delegate to the council the task of determining an appropriate funding model, and strategies to eliminate the need for public bodies to charge fees to other public bodies for geospatial data sharing, delaying the implementation of Section 4 until after the council has figured out a funding approach. State may face a funding shortfall next biennium, unless Measure 97 passes. That shortfall would have an impact on most public bodies. In addition, the funding model has proven to be a much bigger issue than was anticipated, and solutions have been elusive.

Discussion took place around timing and it was determined that we should delay implementation of Section 4 until January 1, 2020 to provide time for the council to determine an appropriate funding model, report that to the Legislature in the 2019 session and provide time for action to be taken to establish the funding model. There will likely need to be changes to the statute after a funding solution has been determined and adopted. Meanwhile, jurisdictions can continue to charge fees to other public bodies under existing statutory authority if needed until the funding model is determined and adopted. Delay until January 1, 2020 also provides sufficient time to put the technology and other resources in place to enable the central clearinghouse.

Change made in Section 7 to make operative date for Section 4 January 1, 2019. Again, decision made to change again to January 1, 2020.

Discussion took place about data custodian versus data steward. For example, ODOT is the data steward for the statewide road centerline Framework dataset, but they are the data custodian only for the state roads portion of that dataset. We added language in Section 1 in an earlier version of the draft LC to incorporate the concept of data aggregators so that groups like Metro, LCOG, ODOT, DOR and others can aggregate Framework data. That way, the Clearinghouse isn't receiving 250 data elements from 1500 public bodies, but rather from a smaller subset that includes the aggregators. We will add the term data steward to the draft LC in such a way to try to ensure that the steward can't be compelled to disclose Framework data, since they aren't the custodian of that data. This is the same protection we have tried to establish for the central Clearinghouse, using the legal definition of custodian that already exists in statute.

Discussion took place about critical infrastructure language in the LC. The intent of the current language is to enable any public body that is the custodian of critical infrastructure data to choose whether or not to share it with other public bodies. We will modify the language to clarify this intention. While it is recognized that critical infrastructure data needs to be in the hands of public bodies engaged in or that support public safety and emergency management activities in advance of an emergency, there is considerable sensitivity to protecting that data from unauthorized access or mishandling, inadvertently or intentionally. Suggestion made to simply remove "from public disclosure" from Section 4. (4)(e). Sean and Cy will work with Pete Boone on this topic to revise the language appropriately.

We will post this [draft LC version](#) on the website while working on revised language for next the meeting.

4. FUNDING MODEL

Based on the earlier discussion, and the short time left in this meeting, we decided not to have further discussion on the funding model topic. Cy did mention the discussion at the sub-group meeting regarding the potential to tap into some of existing fees for programs that rely on Framework data, as one element of a possible funding model. There are 2,497 fees, and the ones that we believe rely in some way on Framework data generate \$762M annually. A very small percentage of those fees would provide significant funding for geospatial Framework data development, maintenance and distribution.

Cy was asked by the sub-group to produce a summary of the [navigatOR Finance Report](#) and provide that summary to the Work Group. He did that and will make the summary, as well as a link to the full report, available on the website. The question that the sub-group had was whether to talk about fees and other funding mechanisms at the upcoming JLCIMT meeting in September.

Discussion took place about what we will talk about at the JLCIMT meeting in September. The deadline for submitting requests for LC drafting to Legislative Counsel is September 26, so that will be a key focus of the conversation at JLCIMT on September 21. We would like to have at least one member of the Work Group to speak, along with Sean and Cy. It was mentioned that we believe this effort will result in savings and that we could mention to the Committee that a pilot study could illustrate some of those savings, thus providing a portion of the needed funding.

5. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Sean and Cy presented the Work Group slide deck at the OAGITM conference in Bend (government IT managers). There was some pushback from one person, indicating that we just need to make a better case for data sharing, we don't need legislation. Cy made the point that the group of stakeholders is too large to make the case to everyone all at once and have it stick. Dean Anderson helped with that part of the discussion, as well, as an attendee and local government CIO. The other point made at that meeting was that the draft LC is creating a governance structure that will enable the stakeholders to decide how, what, when, etc. related to data sharing. The point was made that those points should be at the beginning of the slide deck and probably take out some of the detail about all the things we've tried in the past.

We need to be strategic about communicating with the stakeholders regarding the draft LC. Cy will draft a communication action plan. Point was made that local governments are still asking the question, "What's in it for us?"...what's the value proposition for local government? We need to add more of that to the slide deck and put it at the beginning. Right now, there's one slide on this at the very end. The story map that was created and posted to the geospatial data sharing work group website ([Oregon Framework Data Story Map](#)) illustrates the value of Framework data to all public bodies, but it doesn't hit the point very hard that sharing this data between public bodies is the means for this value to accrue.

That rationale for data sharing should probably be the primary focus of the slide deck. Stakeholders want the 50,000 foot version and possibly the 15,000 foot version, but not the highly detailed version of the story. For emergency response, showing executives that all responders have the same data so they can coordinate their response is a big value. Suggestion made to categorize council participation and show that in a pie chart in the slide deck, possibly comparing it to the existing council. Sean mentioned previous studies conducted by AOC and another by LOC that identified shared services performed by counties and cities, respectively. It's likely that many of those services rely on shared geospatial Framework data. Suggestion made to connect all this to the Regional Solutions Teams and use that mechanism to communicate about this.

6. NEXT STEPS – Sean and Cy

Subgroup will meet at least once before the next Work Group to talk about information to be presented to the JLCIMT and to solidify a communications action plan or strategy. They will also discuss draft LC changes to finalize with the Work Group at the September 16 DSWG meeting.

Sean and Cy will revise the LC based on the discussion at the August 12 DSWG meeting and post that for review by the Work Group prior to the next meeting.

Cy will draft a communications action plan for review and revision by the sub-group before presentation to the Work Group at the September 16 DSWG meeting.

Cy and Sean will revise the slide deck for review and revision by the sub-group before presentation to the Work Group at the September 16 DSWG meeting.

Sean and Cy will begin preparing a report to be presented to the JLCIMT