

Local/State Data Partnership Meeting

Meeting Notes

Attendees

Dean Anderson, Polk County, IT Director
John Griffith, Coos County Commission-Chair
Steve Barnett, Linn County, GIS Manager
Mark Kinslow, OR Dept. of Revenue, CDOT Manager
Sim Ogle, Crook County, GIS Manager
Bob Haas, Deschutes County, GIS Manager
David Ringeisen, ODOT, Transportation Data Manager
Bob Swank, Lane Council of Govts., Associate Director
Ollie Snowden, Lane County, Public Works Director
Cy Smith, OR Dept. of Admin. Services, Statewide GIS Coordinator

Discussion

Cy summarized the purpose of the meeting as an effort to flesh out the details of the data sharing partnership that was proposed at the AOC Executive Board meeting on July 10. Results of work will be presented to AOC Executive Board by Lindsay Ball at the Sept. 11 meeting.

Cy also mentioned that a small group, many of whom were in attendance, had come up with the presentation emailed to this group prior to the meeting. The problem we're trying to address is primarily that government agencies aren't sharing information effectively today. Other problems are indicated in the earlier presentation.

Initial discussion revolved around attempts to determine the necessary components that would be needed for AOC to support a partnership. One of the first items of discussion was whether legislative changes would be needed to create a lasting, effective data sharing partnership. The Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC) has very limited authority based on its establishment by Executive Order. EO compels, to some extent, state agencies to cooperate, but does not really compel local governments. So OGIC doesn't serve as an effective governance model for a data sharing partnership. In addition, OGIC is predominantly composed of state agencies, with little local govt. membership.

Cy indicated that there is a current assessment on every state agency's budget for geospatial data development and management (about \$1.6M/biennium). There is a proposal on the table now to ask the Legislature next session for an additional \$5M for data development, to be used to leverage about 5 or 6 times that much from federal and private sector sources. One of the keys to success for that proposal is to have a partnership between local govt. and the State to develop and share the data in support of the business of government.

John mentioned that one of the things he wanted to be careful about was to develop a partnership that has an exit strategy for local govt. If there are requirements for local govt. in the partnership that require funding, local govts. won't have to participate unless the funding actually comes through. Ollie suggested that there would likely be a local control issue at some point. The partnership has to clearly indicate what data is to be shared so that local govts. will know that they aren't going to be compelled to share data that is confidential, etc.

Cy talked briefly about the Framework data development effort. There are 14 data themes that have been defined, with about 300 data elements spread across those 14 themes. The Framework definition is not finalized, but there's a good start at defining the data that needs to be shared in this proposed partnership.

DAS has developed a business case for developing and sharing the Framework data. It will cost about \$180M to complete the Framework data statewide. The benefits of having that complete, accurate data readily available to all government agencies would be about \$1.2B over ten years, about half to state govt. and half to local govts. The state's share of the cost would be about \$30M, assuming we can leverage that money to the same extent we've been able to leverage data investments in the past. So OGIC's plan is to ask for \$5M in '07-'09, \$10M in '09-'11 and \$15M in '11-'13.

It appears that we are talking about two pieces of legislation – one to establish a governance structure for the partnership and another to fund the accelerated development of the data to be shared. There was some discussion about how to proceed with these two pieces of legislation. The existing state govt. assessment mentioned earlier can fund the governance structure, but new money is needed to fund data development. The group felt that we should move forward with both actions in the upcoming legislative session.

Dean mentioned that the Legislature has, in the past, expressed a dislike for boards and commissions. The group agreed that it would probably be better to define the characteristics of the governance structure and let Lindsay and DAS figure out the details of how to make it happen, how to propose it to the Legislature.

There was some discussion about whether the partnership would be voluntary for local govts. The group agreed that there would need to be quid pro quo from both sides in the partnership, and that if the State didn't come through with its part, the local govts. would have an exit strategy. It can't be an unfunded mandate. If the partnership calls for data development or processing that is beyond what local govt. needs for its own business processes, the funding has to be provided to support that. Bob Swank suggested that, even if the funding couldn't always be accomplished, sharing data was still a good idea and should be a separate issue.

Dean went through the document sent out in the earlier email prior to this meeting, called Building a New GIS Partnership to bring the group more up to speed with the work of the small group that led to the partnership proposal. Of particular importance to this effort is the list of things we would like to accomplish with a partnership, and the actions needed.

There was some discussion about the value brought to the table by the State:

- Funding sources subsidize A&T offices.
- OEM has provided funds for road and address ranges.
- State has coordinated acquisition of aerial imagery.
- ORMAP data standard and funding model has been very successful.

State's coordination role is the primary value the State provides with ORMAP. State could do more, however. State could handle risk and liability issues for local govts. related to data. The AOC presentation indicates a number of categories of contributions the State would make to the partnership, including the items above, but also including:

- standardized emergency maps
- secure off-site data storage
- coordination with federal programs, such as Census and FEMA, to ensure they use good local govt. data.

One of the downsides of ORMAP has been that the data sharing aspect isn't really being addressed yet. ORMAP has run into a roadblock with regard to data sharing. Right now, the only ORMAP data that can be shared is the linework, which doesn't support much in the way of government business processes.

The ODOT model, in cooperation with OEM, passes funds to local governments and takes it upon themselves to take local government data and transform it to fit the statewide road data model.

The governance structure has to be flexible enough to fit the various ways that counties and the departments within counties do business. The governance body could set the parameters for geospatial programs administered by state agencies and operated by local governments. The state agencies would work within those parameters and with local govts. to produce the data. The citizens and interest groups will have to hear and see what the \$5M will get them in terms of things they need.

There are real opportunities to leverage significant federal and private sector funding because we've adopted federal or national standards and we're producing data they need in the form in which they need it.

There was some further discussion about whether we could separate data sharing from governance. Several folks felt like the rules that are needed for data sharing can't be enforced and consistent without governance. There are huge impacts on the geospatial community from legislative activity every session, but there's not a governance structure to monitor those activities and let local govts. and state agencies know about them before they happen.

The governance board would establish OARs that would define the parameters of the partnership, including:

- The development and adoption of data standards that are agreed by the partners
- When data is exchanged, the data will follow the standards
- Funding for development and maintenance of data will be provided
- If funding is not provided, there is no assurance data will be developed or maintained by the partners

Other parameters that the board would establish include data accessibility, data security, and data content. Local govts. that have existing data need funding support to maintain it, particularly to agreed upon standards that likely require more than what is required to meet local government business purposes.

Local govts. currently have an exception to the public records laws that allows local govts. to charge market value for their geospatial data to help them pay for maintenance. It's still public information, it still has to be made available. Some local governments have also developed a value added web service and are charging for that level of data accessibility. For most local govts. that are charging for data, redistribution of the data by a third party is an additional charge or is not allowed.

One of the things that needs to be done before we get to the Legislative session is to develop an inventory of what local govts. have, what we need, and what remains to be developed. This will be a preliminary inventory because the governance board would be responsible for finalizing the inventory and prioritizing data development needs.

AOC needs to hear what it will cost and what the benefits will be. The citizen groups need to hear how things are going to be done better, faster, cheaper. That doesn't have anything to do with governance. So at some point in the very near future, the answers for the citizen groups have to be in place.

A legislative concept written about a year ago was reviewed in some detail by the group. That concept would establish governance for a data sharing partnership between local governments and the State. The legislation would set up the framework for governance, and the details of the partnership would be established by the governance board through Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs). The group suggested several changes to the draft legislative concept, which have now been made.

There was some discussion about how the additional funding request would be allocated to local governments. The point was made that there wouldn't be enough unless the \$5M was leveraged 5 or 6 times to get to approximately \$30M for '07-'09. The Legislature will be informed about the need for additional state funds in the following two biennia. The presentation to AOC will have to include how much savings is expected for each county. Cy mentioned that DAS has produced a business case that projects approximately a 1% savings for government agencies if the GIS Utility is implemented.

The statement was made that counties need to hear how much money is projected to be available for data development and maintenance over time.

The savings projected in the GIS Utility business case are based on productivity increases, cost avoidance, and additional revenue that would be achieved if the government agencies throughout Oregon were acting as one government, whereby there was no, or very little, duplicated effort in terms of data production, maintenance, storage, and access. The business case was not simply based on the increased productivity and cost avoidance that could be achieved by individual counties using GIS more effectively within their county. The GIS Utility concept is not about increasing the use of GIS county by county, agency by agency.

If we can say that there will be a minimum of \$XX available to each county, that can be a powerful argument for moving forward. Managed properly, leveraging will expand that amount substantially. The point was made that economies of scale can significantly enhance the amount of progress that can be made, if we can use the funding to accomplish data development and maintenance for multiple counties and cities as a group, rather than doling out all the funds to individual counties and cities. The governance body might decide to pursue the goals of the GIS Utility in that way.

It would be good to talk to the Congressional delegation about the GIS Utility and the partnership between local and state government, as a national model that could help gain more federal funding.

If AOC supports the partnership concept, which will include governance to guide and maintain the partnership, Lindsay has said he believes we can move forward in some way with the funding request. Not sure yet how the funding will be accomplished, but all the options for that have been drafted and proposed by Cy. The group agreed, however, that the legislative concept for governance should move forward, regardless of the result of the \$5M request. The governance board would be funded, at least for the first biennium, from the DAS assessment for GIS, and staffed by the DAS Geospatial Enterprise Office.

The point was made that the annual AOC conference in November would be the time for building support for this partnership with local governments. Lindsay should speak to the whole group at that conference, to speak about the concept, then others should also speak to the various groups that meet at that conference....County Engineers, Surveyors, Assessors, Commissioners, etc. We need to also find other opportunities to introduce and promote this concept. But the first step is to get buy-in from the AOC Executive Board at the Sept. 11 meeting. A suggestion was made to depict the proposed governance structure graphically.

The regional GIS service center concept was mentioned as part of the GIS Utility, located at community colleges or universities, to serve multiple counties and cities that can't justify having a GIS shop in their individual organizations. The Imagery for the Nation proposal was mentioned as a way of providing for imagery for the entire state, funded

primarily by the feds, but partially funded by state and local govt. for high resolution imagery where needed.

The group further defined the partnership concept, beyond the governance structure and the legislative concept for governance, by defining the roles and responsibilities for each of the parties.

Local Roles/Responsibilities

- Provide standardized Framework data to partners
- Maintain Framework data
- Receive funding for data development/maintenance
- Define data content collaboratively with governance board
- Participate with governance board to increase awareness of legislative impacts for geospatial community and activities
- Lead governance board on rotational basis, shared with State leadership

State Roles/Responsibilities

- Provide standardized Framework data to partners
- Provide funds for data development/maintenance
- Maintain Framework data
- Provide access and distribution of Framework data, securely as appropriate
- Protect partner liability and limit risk, to the extent possible
- Coordinate data standards development and adoption
- Receive funds from feds and private sector for data development/maintenance/access
- Provide products/services, such as emergency maps, aerial imagery, secure off-site storage, etc.
- Coordinate activities with partners
- Facilitate/staff governance structure
- Define data content collaboratively with governance board
- Training
- Coordinate software licensing, contracting, etc.
- Participate with governance board to increase awareness of legislative impacts for geospatial community and activities
- Lead governance board on rotational basis, shared with local govt. leadership

Federal Roles/Responsibilities

Provide funds and resources for data development and maintenance
Use local and state data for federal/national programs
Provide standardized Framework data to partners
Apprise partners of federal funding and partnership opportunities
Provide products/services, such as aerial imagery

There was some discussion about need to focus on government services that will be supported by the data sharing partnership. There is a need to identify the government business that will be supported by the Framework data. In order to define the data structure needed to support government business processes, there is a need to identify those business processes, such as meth response, wildfire response, salmon recovery, road maintenance, etc. There is a need to coordinate the activities of the geospatial data managers with the other professional groups that are responsible for providing government services. The partnership governance structure would do this coordination and work to prioritize the data development needs.

There was some discussion about the form of the partnership agreement and the form of the document to take to the AOC Executive Board on Sept. 11. The document would lay out the problem statement and the proposed actions, in just a couple pages. The governance structure we are proposing would not require any additional funding, but we are also proposing that AOC support the legislative request for additional funds.

John suggested that we leave some areas open for the AOC Board and Legislative Committee to provide input, rather than laying out all the details in advance, so they have an opportunity for buy-in. AOC document could be a draft charter or a draft policy statement. Once AOC offers their support for partnership, we would begin vetting it with other organizations, such as LOC. The legislative concept, in draft form, would be introduced to AOC if they offer support for partnership concept.

The purpose statement from the legislative concept should be reworded and made part of the document that AOC and others see, that describes the partnership concept. It can be referenced by all as we move forward through the legislative session and beyond. Cy will establish a web page on <http://gis.oregon.gov> to post the various materials for this group. John said he thought DAS and the State were doing good work by trying to involve everyone in this from the beginning.