

# 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:** June 20, 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 10:05 am PST. Meeting attendees were:

**Pete Boone** – Tualatin Valley Water District  
**Jeff Frkonja** – Portland Metro Research Center  
**Eric Brandt** – Lane Council of Governments  
**Tom Rohlfig** – Marion County Assessor  
**Ken Kato** – UO Campus GIS & Mapping  
**Molly Vogt** – City of Gresham GIS  
**Mike Schrankel** – Hood River County GIS  
**Dean Anderson** – Polk County IT Director  
**Cy Smith** – Office of State CIO, GEO  
**Erin Doyle** – League of Oregon Cities

**Sean McSpaden** - Legislative Fiscal Office  
**Mark Tennyson** – Oregon Emergency Management  
**Holly Mercer** – DOGAMI Deputy Director  
**John Waffenschmidt** – Lincoln County Surveyor  
**David Williams** – PLSO Legislative Committee  
**Dave Ringeisen** – ODOT, Transportation Info.  
**Jimmy Kagan** – PSU Institute for Natural Resources  
**Graham Slater** – Oregon Employment Department  
**Alex Pettit** – State CIO  
**Theresa Burcsu** – Office of State CIO, GEO

Guests were Jes Mendez, OED; Don Pettit, DEQ; Michael Gurley, OEM; Steve Lucker, DLCD; Bill Burns, DOGAMI, Connor Anderson, DOGAMI

### 2. HAZARDS & EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DATA PRESENTATIONS

At the last meeting, we heard from Tom Rohlfig and Dean Anderson about how tax lot data is compiled and prepared for sharing with the Oregon Department of Revenue. We heard from John Prychun about how tax lot data from the counties is aggregated and prepared for submittal to the Oregon Spatial Data Library hosted by the Office of the State CIO's Geospatial Enterprise Office (GEO), and we heard from Bob Harmon about how tax lot data is used by the Department of Water Resources related to water rights.

At this meeting, Steve Lucker with DLCD, the Hazards Framework Implementation Team (FIT) Chair, and Bill Burns with DOGAMI presented information about the use of Framework data by the Hazards FIT. Their presentation is on the website. Steve and Bill made the following key points:

- Hazards FIT has 10 subgroups that organize data for their work and make it available
- Key effort is to develop one-stop shop for hazards data, making authoritative data discoverable
- Have to pay attention to scale and purpose of data before combining with other data
- Need to recognize and perhaps incorporate ancillary data sets that aren't part of Framework
- Would like to ensure that all web viewers for hazards consume the same authoritative data
  - Showed RAPTOR, Hazards Reporter, and DOGAMI hazards viewer
  - Hazards Reporter is part of Oregon Explorer, which also hosts the Oregon Spatial Data Library (OSDL) viewer and an associated viewer for map services
  - Many data services are consumed by those viewers, but are available to any other viewer

- Lidar is critical for identifying all previously identified landslides as starting point for predictions
- SLIDO landslide data available on the web for streaming or download, and from GEO's OSDL
- Purpose of making data widely available is to support collaborative work to reduce risk
- There are quite a few areas of the state that are susceptible to landslides, but not covered by SLIDO data
- This data is a benefit to local governments from data sharing efforts, however there are a number of data sets that could be created from the Lidar data but are not currently available
- Finding a way to either make the very large Lidar data easily accessible to all public bodies, or creating a variety of products (e.g., hillshade) and making those widely accessible would be good
  - We probably need to do both for different users (engineers vs. planners)
  - It would be a benefit to local governments for planning and regulatory purposes to develop a statewide data set with 5 ft. contours from the Lidar for purposes of preventing development on slopes that are too steep.
- In addition to lack of adequate, sustainable funding at the State level for creating Lidar, lack of adequate, sustainable funding at the local government level to incorporate this data into their resilience and comprehensive plans is currently a barrier to data sharing
- DOGAMI will be requesting funding from the Legislature next session for a comprehensive hazards assessment for all communities, to help determine where the State should invest to reduce risk
- Improving the hazards web viewers to make hazards data more easily discoverable would help
- DOGAMI has used Lidar from local government and other sources for SLIDO, too

Michael Gurley with OEM presented information on the RAPTOR (Real Time Assessment and Planning Tool for Oregon) situational awareness tool and on OEM's efforts to make Framework data from the Public Safety Answering Points (911 centers) available to other public bodies. His presentation is on the website. Michael made the following key points:

- RAPTOR is geospatially enabled, web-based situational awareness tool for first responders at all levels of government so they all have access to/view the same data (in real time)
  - Public version and secure version, each with lots of local, state and national data (and web map services)
  - Can incorporate data/web map services into the app in real time; used extensively in Cascadia Rising exercise
- Most of the data in RAPTOR is consumed in the app via live web map services, not static data
- RAPTOR was developed in 2010 by OEM, GEO and Multnomah County as part of national pilot
- Hundreds of first responders at local level use RAPTOR now, including Framework data
- There are currently 43 PSAPs in Oregon, not all coincident with county boundaries
- Data from PSAPs, local govts, and vendors flows into and supports 9-1-1 function
  - Vendors support 16 9-1-1 centers, local govts. support 9 and PSAPs support 14
  - OEM reimburses funding to these entities for data development that supports 9-1-1
  - Funding for data to support 9-1-1 is in the \$1.5-\$3M range; 9-1-1 fund is about \$79M/yr
- There is data duplication happening in the process of creating data to support 9-1-1
  - Multiple data sets are sometimes being developed for the same features
  - Relationships between PSAPs and other local govt. agencies are inconsistent
  - Fixing those relationships and eliminating duplication has to be done without damaging 9-1-1 functionality...we'll have to be careful about how we do this
- We have the technical ability now to change the model, from a two-way model to one in which everyone gets authoritative data from a central hub, which will eliminate many of the duplication issues that currently exist
- OEM uses a data sharing agreement that gives PSAPs an option to share centerlines with other public bodies and/or the public
  - Many have chosen to share centerlines only with other PSAPs
- Next Generation 9-1-1 is currently being planned; it won't function without certain comprehensive, standardized, statewide Framework data sets (PSAP boundaries, Emergency Service Zone boundaries, road alias tables, road centerlines, address points)

Don Pettit with DEQ, the Chair of the Preparedness Framework Implementation Team, presented information on how the PrepFIT uses Framework data. His presentation is on the website. Don made the following key points:

- PrepFIT has done a lot of work over the last couple of years, with limited funding from various sources, to organize and provide accessibility to data necessary for emergency response and planning
- Spent a lot of time looking at hundreds of data sets to narrow authoritative data catalog to ~250 data sets in the new OR-IRIS geodatabase
- PrepFIT has used HSIP Gold data to do some quality control and comparison with Oregon data
  - That effort indicates a clear need to do a better job of sharing data between public bodies at all levels
- The published geodatabase is available as a physical copy for off-line access; accessing the secure version of the data requires a signed data use agreement
- Need a programmatic arrangement whereby all public bodies are connected to the location for downloading a cached version of the data
- Data (web map services) have actually been incorporated into RAPTOR now
- Data sharing agreement is under review by DOJ now for making data accessible to public bodies
- DOGAMI data sharing for SLIDO and other data is a good model, made available via web for all
- Who decides what data should be securely managed is a question that hinders data sharing
- Keeping track of who is responsible for stewardship and maintenance of data needs improvement

### 3. DRAFT LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT

Work Group directed subgroup at May meeting to draft legislative concept (LC) for review. Sean presented the draft LC. The yellow highlights in the copy on the website represent changes made after the initial subgroup review. The draft LC is posted to the website. **Note:** The draft LC was developed internally and has not yet been reviewed/formally drafted by legislative counsel.

We added the concept of data aggregator to the definition of “public bodies” within the draft LC, in Section 1. In Section 2, the draft LC establishes the Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC), with a more equitable and diverse membership than the current OGIC that was created by Executive Order 00-02. The structure emulates the structure of the Geospatial Data Sharing Work Group, and emulates the structure of the State Interoperability Executive Committee, which is statutorily established under the authority of the State CIO.

Section 3 sets out some of the duties and responsibilities of OGIC, including rule-making authority. This follows closely the duties and responsibilities laid out in the existing Executive Order 00-02. It specifically calls OGIC’s duty to establish the Framework Implementation Team as part of the governance structure, and specifies that part of the governance structure for the collaboratively identification of Framework data sets to be shared, the frequency of sharing, the standards for Framework data development, and identifying funding mechanisms, etc.

Section 4 incorporates the core elements of HB4056 from the 2016 legislative session, while referencing OGIC as the decision-making, governance body. It indicates that the State GIO will take all appropriate measures to secure data stored in the Oregon Spatial Data Library in compliance with existing statutes. Also prohibits public bodies from redistributing Framework data, which they have acquired from the Oregon Spatial Data Library, to other public bodies and/or to the public. We will be seeking DOJ and Legislative Counsel confirmation of the legality of the custodian concept used to prohibit redistribution.

Section 5 establishes the OGIC Fund, without specifically requesting or placing funds within it. It may be that the existing Framework funding that comes from state agency assessments could be placed in this dedicated fund. OGIC will determine how to expend money from the OGIC Fund.

Section 6 creates the State GIO position and the Geospatial Enterprise Office within the Office of the State CIO, with the primary role to support the Council and its activities, emulating the statutory establishment of the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator supporting the Statewide Interoperability Executive Council.

Section 7 specifies the timing of the proposed law, with Section 4 requiring data sharing between public bodies to be delayed until at least July 1, 2018, providing time to work out the business model and funding issues being discussed by this Work Group.

The Work Group is asked to review the draft LC and get comments back to Sean and Cy by the end of July. Sean will distribute a Word version of the LC to all Work Group members for mark up.

#### Business Model and Funding Discussion

Jeff Fronkja and Dean Anderson presented some slides to illustrate problems with the current thinking on the draft LC that may exacerbate issues with existing business models for some local and regional governments that derive some funding to support their operations by charging other public bodies for Framework data.

There's no funding in the current draft LC. Section 4 says that public bodies will share Framework data with other public bodies as long as they don't incur any costs to do so, which gives any public body an excuse not to share. Section 4 also says public bodies won't charge any fees to each other for sharing Framework data. This creates a conflict that we need to resolve in some way. In particular, the existing business models for Metro and LCOG will be negatively impacted, but there are a few other local governments that may also be in this situation.

In the process of getting statewide Framework data to the Oregon Spatial Data Library, there are various steps where aggregation and/or transformation of data must happen, either at the local, regional or state level. This aggregation and transformation costs money. The funding sources for this aggregation and transformation activity in some cases involve fees at the local and regional levels. If done at the state level, this activity is either absorbed by agencies or paid by the agency assessment mentioned earlier. There are also areas in the state where data is not being created. We need to figure out funding for that data creation, as well.

Delaying the discussion about funding and rebuilding or revising the business model with the idea that we'll figure it out later may result in the legislature telling us to find funding from the savings we're saying data sharing will accrue. That may not work out well.

There was an extended discussion about the Business Model Options/Pros & Cons slide in their presentation. The ORMAP program model seems to have worked well, but creating something like that would be difficult since the funding method specific to ORMAP has now been prohibited by law. The newly established OGIC may be the right place to have this discussion, determining collaboratively how to best revise the business model for funding Framework data development, maintenance, aggregation, transformation and sharing. The concept of eliminating fees charged between public bodies for Framework data would create a \$40,000 annual hole in the Metro budget, as an example, unless Metro can effectively determine an alternative method for cost recovery.

There are quite a few funding methods out there that could be tapped for Framework data purposes. Dozens of program missions that rely on Framework data are funded with a variety of fees. Capturing a tiny percentage of each of those fees could substantially fund everything that needs to be done to provide Framework data for those programs and everything else that needs the data. The navigatOR business case done in 2006 included a [Financing Options](#) document posted on the website.

The concept of offloading current public fees to private payers (#5 on the Business Model slide) is very possible, and has been done in other places. A model has existed in Alberta, Canada for the last 16 or

17 years, called the AltaLIS<sup>1</sup>, and is operated by the organization *Alberta Data Partnerships*<sup>2</sup>. This model was incorrectly identified as the *Spatial Data Warehouse* during the Work Group meeting. The AltaLIS and Alberta Data Partnerships have demonstrated that the market can bear the cost of this data. The Coalition of Geospatial Organizations (COGO) has developed a model law that states could use to modify their existing public records statutes to allow Framework data to be aggregated by the private sector and have value added to the data, then sharing the profits for sale of that aggregated, value-added data with all public bodies. This is a public/private partnership concept.

Pooling existing funds for aerial imagery is an example of a way we could possibly do things better, as well. We probably aren't going to find a silver bullet in terms of a single way to resolving this business model problem. It will likely take a coordinated approach involving a number of solutions. We decided not to discuss at this meeting the concept of a pilot project to resolve the business model issues. Some Work Group members were somewhat concerned about the idea of eliminating fees charged by public bodies to other public bodies for Framework data sharing without first knowing how we're going to resolve the business model issues. The Work Group directed the sub-group to do some additional research/thinking on the business model and, if possible, come back at the next meeting with alternatives for resolving the business model issues that have been identified.

#### **4. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY**

We made a lot of changes to the presentation slides that anyone can use to speak to groups about the Data Sharing Work Group and its activities. The presentation is available on the website.

Theresa Burcsu presented a story map that she and Josh put together to explain what Framework data is, what people use it for, and why it's important. The story map can be viewed at <http://arcg.is/1Yf7fCy>. The URL will be posted to the Work Group website, as well. We will be adding a local government use case to the story map soon. Please use this story map as you talk about the activities of the Work Group, either in person or by email, etc.

#### **5. NEXT STEPS – Sean and Cy**

Subgroup will make any changes to the draft LC suggested by the Work Group by July 31, for review by the DSWG at the next meeting. Sean will send a Word version of the draft LC to all DSWG members.

Sean and Cy will explore the development of a webinar that folks can use to initiate discussion with various groups

Subgroup will work on alternatives for the business model issues raised during this meeting, for presentation at the next DSWG meeting in August.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:00pm PST.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.altalis.com/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://abdatapartnerships.ca/>