Oregon Geographic Information Council

Meeting Date**:** **October 25, 2023**

Time: 10:00am to 2:00 pm

Location: Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, Classroom

4034 Fairview Industrial Dr. SE

Salem, OR 97302

Attendance:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OGIC Members** | | | | | |
| \*Representative Paul Evans |  | Patti Sauers | X | Ed Flick |  |
| \*Senator Dennis Linthicum |  | Tom Rohlfing |  | Traci Naile | X |
| Marguarite Becenti | X | Lisa Gaines |  | Dan Brown | X |
| Brad Cross | X | Molly Gartrell Earle |  | Madeline Steele | X |
| Brenda Bateman |  | Steven Hoffert | X |  |  |
| Maylian Pak |  | Shad Campbell | X | Fed. Govt - vacant |  |
| Rachel L. Smith | X | Brent Grimsrud | X | Public Utility – vacant |  |
| Chris Wright |  | Ned Fairchild |  | Special District - vacant |  |

\* denotes a non-voting member by statute. (ORS 276A.503)

In-Person Guests and Presenters: Melissa Foltz, Tom Elder, Lacey Summers

*The OGIC meeting was recorded and the audio/video is available on the OGIC web page. Minutes document a summary of the agenda item, action items and decisions made at the meeting.*

| **Agenda Item** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- |
| **OGIC Roll Call** | Members present at the meeting are indicated above. |
| **Item 1: Consent Agenda and Agenda Approval** | The Consent Agenda included the following items for approval:   1. Draft July Meeting Minutes 2. GPL Report in Meeting Packet   **Action**  Motion to approve Consent Agenda made by Steven Hoffert; Seconded by Marguarite Becenti.  Motion passed. |
| **Item 2: Statewide Parcels Initiative** | Rachel Smith gave a presentation to OGIC members providing an overview of the recently launched Statewide Parcels Initiative.   1. Initiative with 3 phases: Pilot, Expansion, and Operations & Maintenance. Currently working on the pilot to develop the strategy for a successful program, to test the processes, tools, and workflows needed for the larger implementation of the project, and to allow staff time to enhance their knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for the prj. 2. Project Goals & Objectives    1. Data aggregation    2. Statewide feature service available to everyone/public    3. Web viewer of parcel data    4. Governance    5. Relationships/Collaboration with local gov’t    6. Build Internal Capacity to do the work 3. Project has 3 primary components    1. Governance    2. Data Intake / QAQC / Transformation    3. Communications / User Training 4. Project Team Includes staff from the Geospatial Enterprise Operations (GEO), Dept. of Revenue, and the 5 pilot counties: Yamhill, Marion, Baker, Harney, and Washington. 5. 1Spatial is a new software package to aid in data validation and aggregation.    1. Counties create and maintain parcel data    2. Counties upload data to 1DataGateway, but retain ownership of their data    3. Counties match attributes to the state standard; geometry is unaltered    4. Parcels published in GEOHub 6. Policy/Data Challenges    1. Real property table and the inclusion of owner information    2. Fees charged by counties    3. Commercial entities to resell data    4. Data quality concerns    5. Data standard as “guidance” document   OGIC provided general input on a few items. 1) OGIC will receive quarterly project updates, 2) publication should include owner information as it is not PII, allowed to be shared via public records rules, and included in the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard.  ORMAP program will continue as-is to support the county assessors.  The 1Spatial tool will allow for attribute/schema matching so that we don’t need to ask the local gov’t to change their attribute names and schema. We save the matching for future uploads/data automation processes. |
| **Item 3: Legislative Coordination Committee Update** | Steven Hoffert provided an update on the legislative coordination committee activities. Focusing on talking points for OGIC members to talk to Legislators at upcoming Leg. Days; will be talking to Sean McSpaden about a good strategy for these meetings. Committee has also been working on developing performance measures for the legislative coordination and sustainable funding priority initiatives.  **Measure #3:** # of OGIC recommended Policy Option Packages and Legislative Concepts related to sustainable funding approved by the legislature.  **Measure #7:** # of OGIC recommended Policy Option Packages and Legislative Concepts related to sustainable funding approved by the legislature.  **Measure 8:** # of legislators OGIC members met with to promote and discuss GIS-related topics.  **Measure 9:** # of bills receiving public comment or written testimony from OGIC.  Leg. Committee has authority to act on behalf of OGIC to respond/comment on bills. Committee will bring back activities performed to OGIC at the quarterly meetings.  Discussion about Measure #9 and “relevant” bills/gis-related vs. all bills, and potentially changing it to a % vs. a #.  Final vote on performance measures is Agenda Item #8.  Several of the measures will be setting baseline numbers early in the process.  EIS has a legislative coordinator that uses keywords to look for bills of interest. Need to work more closely with the EIS resources available to OGIC. |
| **Item 4: Outreach & Communications Committee Update** | Rachel Smith provided an update on Outreach and Communications Committee activities since the last meeting. The committee focused on designing and purchasing vendor booth materials and graphics to support OGIC outreach activities, using GovDelivery for communications, and drafting performance measures for OGIC’s review and approval. Willow Crum, GIS Analyst at DAS GEO, represented OGIC at the NW GIS User Conference in Yakima WA; Minimal booth materials for her to use, but good conversations with participants which improved following her presentation on GEOHub.  New vendor booth materials were purchased for OGIC and on display for OGIC members at the meeting. These materials are available to all OGIC members for outreach activities.  Dan Brown and Brad Cross noted that registration for events needs to happen several months in advance of the event in order for OGIC to have a booth.  GIS In Action conference is Oregon’s main GIS conference and will happen late April/early May 2024.  Draft performance measures for the committee:  **Measure #1:** Increase in the # of new subscribers to OGIC communications list serve.  **Measure #2:** GIS community survey regarding general awareness of OGIC’s responsibilities and activities.  GovDelivery is not approved by EIS for OGIC to use for communications. The committee plans to establish a new list serve for the planned communications. The committee will therefore need to update the Communications Plan and bring it back to OGIC in January for review and approval. |
| **Item 5: Framework Data Inventory** | Melissa Foltz presented to OGIC an update on the Framework Data Inventory and the remaining tasks that occurred since the last meeting: specifically, data proposed for removal from the inventory and the future considerations list.  Multiple rounds of review and conversations occurred about specific datasets proposed for removal. In the end, the Framework Coordinator recommended keeping 15 datasets that were originally on the full list of data to remove.  The Framework Coordinator recommended that the program keep the datasets for “future consideration” within the individual FIT workplans instead of including them in the actual inventory since these data do not exist and are items that the FITs can focus on for future development.  OGIC has an official process documented for adding items from the future considerations list to the inventory at a later time as the need arises.  **Action**  Motion: Move to approve the Framework Coordinator’s Recommendation for the Existing Framework Data Elements Proposed for Removal and maintaining the Data Elements for Future Consideration in FIT work plans separate from the data inventory.  Motion made by Dan Brown; Seconded by Patti Sauers.  Discussion: none  0 Against, 0 Abstained  Motion passed. |
| **Item 6: OGIC Leadership / Chair-Elect Nominations** | Chair-Elect position for OGIC will become vacant in January. Chris Wright was unable to make the meeting in person, but had communicated with Rachel Smith prior to the meeting about his interest and supervisor approval for him to serve in a leadership position.  Rachel nominated Chris Wright for the Chair Elect position.  No other nominations were made.  **Action**  Motion: The motion was made to approve the nomination of Chris Wright as Chair-Elect of OGIC.  Motion made by Rachel Smith; Seconded by Brent Grimsrud.  0 Against, 0 Abstained  Motion passed. |
| **Item 7: Data Sharing and Governance Committee Update** | Shad Campbell and Melissa Foltz presented to OGIC an overview of activities of the Data Sharing and Governance Committee since the last meeting: specifically, the Framework Grant Program, implementing the data sharing processes and procedures, and draft performance measures for the *Improve Data Sharing* priority initiative.  The committee has identified ~ 15 data stewards for 60 publicly shared data elements for consultation. Still unclear is the update frequency for these datasets. The consultation process will allow the Framework Coordinator to update this information in the Inventory.  Draft Performance Measures for consideration;  **Measure #4:** # of counties contributing parcel data to GEO for statewide aggregation and publication to the public.  **Measure #5:** # of geospatial Framework datasets where OGIC has performed consultation prior to OGIC endorsement of dataset for sharing.  **Measure:** % of geospatial Framework datasets appealed to OGIC and then shared following consultation, negotiation, or assistance.  Grant Program Recommendations Presented:   1. Create budget allocations for the OGIC fund to better manage the money.    1. executive committee provide reports on the OGIC fund quarterly in order to consider needed adjustments to the funding category amounts.    2. fund split into 4 categories: $50K for misc. expenses, $150K for grant projects, $150K for federal/other projects requiring a state match, and $150K to mitigate data sharing appeals/concerns raised by data custodians. 2. Replace the 70/30 funding split with a better scoring criteria    1. Project objectives, priority datasets, stewardship & standards, and new data development 3. Discuss OGIC’s priorities at Framework Forums for community awareness 4. Add OGIC’s Technical Advisory Committee to the RFP review process   Discussion about OGIC funding and allocations:  OGIC can adjust the funding allocations as needed after discussion and a vote at quarterly OGIC meetings.  Funds roll-over to future biennia. Federal projects tend to be large and could benefit from the rollover.  Management of the OGIC fund is performed by the executive committee.  The committee will not be approving appeals projects or grant projects. These projects must come to OGIC for review and approval. The committee will review and vet the projects prior to OGIC approval.  Appeal projects and that review process has not yet been articulated. Likely similar to the grant program process to develop a project and then the subsequent review of the project. But these would not go through an official RFP as they would need to be ad hoc submittals to OGIC.  **Actions**  Motion: I move to approve the DSC’s Recommendation to create budget allocations for the OGIC fund.  Motion made by Dan Brown; Seconded by Traci Naile.  0 Against, 0 Abstained  Motion passed.  Motion: I move to approve the DSC’s Recommendations 2-4 for the Framework Grant Program.  Motion made by Shad Campbell; Seconded by Madeline Steele.  0 Against, 0 Abstained  Motion passed. |
| **Item 8: OGIC Performance Measures** | The OGIC Chair asked for a motion on the full set of draft performance measures presented and discussed during the committee report agenda items.  Discussion about Measure #9 where comments were made earlier in the meeting. Explanation of why the measure was crafted as-is: Use of specific # vs. % was used because it was the simplest method for a measure. It is more of a “report out” item. Doing a % would require us to know the baseline of the # of GIS-related bills. Discussion of the use of keywords to find “gis-related” bills. We will want to update the list of keywords used in the future. Consensus at the end of the discussion was to leave the performance measure as originally written, but that OGIC would like to know in the report-out how many GIS-related bills the legislative coordination committee tracked during a legislative session.  **Action**  Motion: I move to approve the performance measures presented in the Staff Report.  Motion made by Brent Grimsrud; Seconded by Steven Hoffert.  0 Against, 0 Abstained  Motion passed. |
| **Item 9: Imagery for Oregon** | Rachel Smith gave a presentation and led a discussion about Imagery in Oregon.  Summary of the presentation:   1. Imagery 101 / History; statewide collections have historically been ortho photos at varying resolutions; often partner with the NAIP program out of the USDA and collected for agriculture purposes. The NAIP imagery is not collected by default at a resolution (2ft) that meets many Oregon use cases. We have never collected statewide oblique imagery which is typically used and needed at the local government level. 2. Oregon Statewide Imagery Program (OSIP); partnership with the Imagery FIT and DAS GEO; GEO does the administrative and contracting work and the FIT leads the technical piece of the collection to ensure we collect the correct/best imagery at specifications that meet our needs for the $$ in hand. 3. In 2022, the State “passed the hat” to collect funds to buy a higher resolution 1ft. aerial imagery via the NAIP program. In 2022 we struggled to get the $ necessary to purchase for the state. Legislative funds are needed to have a sustainable imagery program or via a long-term funding strategy with all levels of govt in Oregon contributing. 4. Imagery Portfolio; determine and document a set of imagery products that meet multiple use cases for a consistent acquisition for the State; need a reasonable cost and have options for local buy-ups and derivative products. 5. Long-term Funding Strategy; the imagery portfolio is underway and funds are available now to hire a consultant to determine a long-term funding strategy that brings all participating gov’t to the table. Legislative request for permanent funding is likely needed to support ALL of Oregon and its use cases. 6. 2024 Imagery Collection    1. In 2022 the state used the NAIP program to get a 1ft resolution product; this method is a great ROI for Oregon.    2. In 2024, we have $1.5M from the legislature for a purchase and have a few options – go with NAIP program again, consider a subscription service which is cheaper in order to purchase (we don’t have enough money to purchase imagery for the state like we have typically done in the past.).    3. Lots of problems with the 2022 collection with NAIP. GEO would like to consider other options.   OGIC’s consensus is to try a subscription option since it is likely what we can afford in 2024; we do not need to do the lowest cost option when it doesn’t meet our needs and there were substantial issues using the NAIP program. DAS GEO will need to inform the legislature of our plan to not use the NAIP program as stated in the policy option package (funding request). |
| **Item 9: Public Comment** | None. |
| **Meeting Adjourned** | **Action:** Motion to adjourn made by Rachel Smith. |