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:	September 16, 2016 (10:00 AM - 1:00 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:

Dean Anderson – Polk County CIO
Jeff Frkonja – Portland Metro Research Center
Eric Brandt – Lane Council of Governments
Tom Rohlfing – Marion County Assessor
Jim Rue – DLCD Director
Molly Vogt – City of Gresham GIS
Curtis Cude – OHA Public Health
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
Dave Williams – PLSO Legislative Committee
Jimmy Kagan – PSU Institute for Natural Resources
Jerry Martin – State Police
Theresa Burcsu – Office of State CIO, GEO

Guests were Michael Gurley, OEM; Scott Lane, OEM; Rebecca Gladstone, League of Women Voters; Dave Ringeisen, ODOT

There were no changes suggested to the meeting notes for the August 12 meeting; notes were adopted.

2. DRAFT LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT

Sean walked through the changes made to the draft legislative concept (LC) since the last version that was posted on the website. The new version is v0.12 and includes changes made as a result of the last Work Group meeting and a few proposed changes that have been suggested by Work Group members since the last Work Group meeting.

There were a few small wording changes made in the Summary to reflect changes made later in the document. In the definitions in Section 1, we added the definition of custodian from ORS 192.410. We also added the definition of data steward from the existing Framework program.

Sean clarified that there will be ample opportunity for the Work Group to weigh in on these and other changes at a later Work Group meeting when the formal/actual draft LC is returned from Legislative Counsel.

In Section 2, we added the words “Health and” to the line about a Human Services agency as part of OGIC.

We made a change in Section 3 based on sub-group deliberations to call the Framework Implementation Teams, Advisory Committees. That change is meant to indicate that the advisory committees would be comprised of a mix of policy level folks, program managers, and technical staff. It would potentially use the ORMAP structure as a model.

Also in Section 3, a change was made in the way OGIC is to review GIS plans and activities of state agencies and other public bodies, to clarify that the review is to be conducted to identify opportunities for collaboration, reduction of duplication, etc.

Question was asked about how the governance structure would actually work. Sean indicated that we have tried deliberately not to put too much detail in the statute, to give OGIC an opportunity to set the structure in a charter for themselves. Cy indicated that the structure would likely be similar to what it is now, with OGIC policy advisory and technical advisory committees, and that the Framework Advisory Committee would also likely have policy and technical subgroups organized around framework data themes. There are significant policy issues for OGIC that are not specifically related to data, which would need to be addressed by an OGIC policy committee. There are also significant technical issues that need to be addressed by OGIC that are beyond Framework data. But there are significant policy and technical issues that the Framework Advisory Committee would need to address, which would likely require work groups and/or subcommittees to be formed.

In Section 4, the term data steward is introduced. We also changed the subsection on critical infrastructure information to indicate that it may be shared voluntarily at the discretion of the public body that is the custodian of the critical infrastructure information. That change better addresses stakeholder concerns regarding mandatory data sharing of this sensitive information and aligns with other statutes that exempt critical infrastructure data from public disclosure.

Change made to indicate the OGIC is responsible for adopting Framework data standards, removing language that indicated that standards could be adopted by either the Council or the State CIO. This change was made to ensure there would be no future conflict/confusion between the State CIO and the Council in terms of adopting data standards affecting non-executive branch/state agency public bodies.

Finally, a change was made to indicate that Section 4 will take effect on January 1, 2020, NOT January 1, 2019. That will be six months after the end of the 2019 legislative session, where OGIC is likely to come to the Legislature with changes to the statute that will enable the elimination of fees charged by public bodies to other public bodies for sharing geospatial Framework data with each other, and potentially for funding the development, maintenance, and sharing of geospatial Framework data going forward.

Sean indicated that the JLCIMT would see a summary document at their next meeting, on September 21, indicating that the Work Group has general agreement on the language of a draft LC and requests the JLCIMT grant approval to seek Legislative Counsel drafting of the legislative concept for pre-session filing.

Sean next walked the Work Group through some additional changes that were suggested by members of the Work Group since the last meeting regarding OGIC committees/workgroups and OGIC representation/membership.

Dean suggested adding a change in Section 3 such that OGIC shall establish standing committees and ad hoc work groups as needed to achieve its purpose. This is to address a concern by some that the existing OGIC structures wouldn't be continued. This change was agreed to by the Work Group at this meeting and will be included in the next version of the draft LC.

Concerns were raised by some state agency members of the existing OGIC regarding the significant changes that are being proposed to the OGIC structure. Specifically, OGIC membership has been dominated by natural resource state agencies and those agencies will have a much diminished voice in the new OGIC. The issues that have come up over the years, however, have not reflected a balanced approach in terms of the various perspectives that need to be addressed for a statewide approach to geospatial policy, data and technology governance as it relates to/affects all public bodies operating in Oregon.

Jimmy proposed language to make state agency representation on OGIC more general:

- GIO would advise Gov and CIO on state agency membership
    - 3 state agencies representing air, water, land, infrastructure
        - This could be natural resources, transportation, and planning
    - 2 state agencies representing health & human services, economic & community development, and administration
    - 2 state agencies representing public safety and emergency management

This would potentially give more flexibility than the current membership/appointment language within the draft LC provides. This will be discussed further at the DSWG sub-group. There is a reluctance to expand OGIC beyond the number currently in the LC, due to the size of the Council and the difficulty in managing a larger body, making decisions, etc. A more equitable representation of the membership is very important if we expect to have a balanced approach to funding, interest and participation. In addition, we are dependent on local governments for much of the data that we all need, including the natural resource agencies. Molly made the point that there are three members specified now from the public safety and emergency management sector (2 state and one local). If we can't get someone interested in filling those three spots, we will have wasted slots. It was also pointed out in this discussion that there would be a need in this model to have sectors have discussions within their sectors, outside of OGIC, in order to represent those sectors effectively, and that's a good thing.

Eric Brandt voiced a suggested change he had suggested earlier about adding councils of government after the mention of Regional Governments on the local side of OGIC membership. There was no objection to making that change in Section 3.

Question was asked by Erin Doyle as to whether the State CIO could make appointments to the Council, after suggestion was made that we might want to look at ways to streamline appointments. The Governor's Office is significantly behind now in making appointments. If the Council has any kind of regulatory authority, there may be a need to have all appointments made by the Governor. Sean will ask about this.

The suggestion was made to add language within the draft LC regarding a term for OGIC membership, to allow for rotation of Natural Resource members and others. In talking about the way OGIC would likely work going forward, particularly with the Framework Advisory Committees, it was pointed out that there are over 1000 candidates for election in the upcoming contests for which an address cannot be determined. This is an issue that will be addressed by the Framework Advisory Committees, in terms of policy, technology and data. Sean will include basic/placeholder language within the draft LC regarding member appointment term limits (and the ability to be reappointed) prior to submitting a request for drafting to Legislative Counsel.

3. JLCIMT PLANS

Sean spoke briefly about the written report that he will prepare for the Committee prior to the JLCIMT meeting on September 21, 2016. Cy talked about the presentation he and John Waffenschmidt will make to the Committee at the meeting. He said that he might get asked questions about how the data sharing LC aligns with the national Framework activities, based on questions Rep. Nathanson has asked in the past at other hearings.

Cy asked the group if there were other topics to specifically cover. One suggestion was to focus on why data sharing is important, why an LC to mandate it is important. Data stewardship and data security is also important to specifically mention, as is the fact that we are paying attention to existing statutes related to protection of personally identifiable information. These are important issues for local governments (tax assessment) and state agencies (health information).

The JLCIMT agenda will also include topics related to data security (Executive Order 16-13 - Cybersecurity in Oregon) immediately before we talk about the data sharing LC, so making sure we are ready for questions that relate or conflate the two issues will be important. Broadband will also be a topic

at the Committee meeting, prior to our presentation. GEO maintains the statewide broadband map and keep it updated for Business Oregon, so there could be questions related to that.

4. COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES

Cy walked through the shortened version of the Data Sharing LC presentation. It was shortened for a presentation at the GIS 911 conference in Redmond a couple weeks before the Work Group meeting. The revised version of the shortened presentation will be posted to the Work Group website soon for everyone to access and use in other presentations.

On the value propositions slide, it was mentioned that we captured some hot button issues. Affordable housing, however, is a missing hot button issue right now. The phasing we've now agreed upon hasn't been made in the shortened version yet, but will be made before the presentation is posted. It was suggested that we not include specific dates related to phasing to avoid any distractions.

It was pointed out that the slides about Framework make it look like we have this whole situation under control already. However, ad hoc sharing hasn't worked well. OGIC to this point has done pretty well managing state-developed data, but overall, sharing hasn't worked well. Local governments share to some extent with each other, but it's not consistent. Dean had some other ideas about this that he will send to Cy by email after the Work Group meeting to improve the slides.

There was a suggestion at the sub-group that the Transportation Framework example from the larger presentation be replaced with a more realistic example of existing road centerlines somewhere in the state. Cy will add a link to the Framework Story Map that shows the Transportation Framework. Scrolling around within that portion of the Story Map and clicking on various road centerlines enables one to show the data attached to each line segment in popup dialog boxes, and provides a good example of what Framework entails.

There were suggestions about reordering the slides to either define Framework earlier, or explain the problem earlier. Cy indicated that the shortened slides will be posted as a PowerPoint slide so the order can be changed depending on the audience. The longer slide deck will be posted as PowerPoint instead of PDF, as well, for the same reason. It was also noted that the value proposition slides might need to be simplified, the reference to specific data sets now may be too geeky. Real life examples using the Framework Story Map would be a good way to illustrate the data sharing value proposition.

Cy walked through the four high level action items in the Communication Action Plan he sent around to the Work Group members earlier. He will be working on bulleted talking points to be approved by the Work Group and then used by various members as they talk to groups and individuals about the LC.

The Powerpoint presentation that is currently posted to the website will be modified to reflect changes made in the shortened version, and both will be posted soon as Powerpoints, rather than PDFs. These two presentations can be used by various members as they talk to groups and individuals about the LC.

Cy has created a Google doc and made it accessible to the Work Group to use in collecting the names of key people with whom to communicate about the LC and the Work Group's activities to date. The same Google doc also contains a section for collecting meetings/conferences where presentations should be made about the LC and the Work Group's activities to date. Volunteer assignments should be added to the Google doc to indicate who will be doing the communicating for each key person or meeting/conference. A number of suggestions were made to add key people and meetings to the Google doc. Anyone in the Work Group can edit the document. Each member of the Work Group is asked to enter at least one key person and one meeting or conference related to the stakeholder group they represent.

It was asked when we should target as an end date for communication about the LC/bill. Sean felt like we should continue to communicate about it, honing our message, until at least mid-March, perhaps later

depending on what happens with the bill in Committee during the legislative session. That means we should be targeting meetings starting now and running until mid-March.

A few other key points were raised to be added to the talking points. One was about noting that the LC will eliminate contentious issues that have come up with the various cadastral data sharing agreements that have been circulated and used over the last few years. Another was to make a point about the importance of the OGIC restructure, making the local/state partnership stronger and more likely to succeed. Pushing information about the LC to a listserv, rather than relying on people to pull the information from the website, would be a good next step. We could also offer via that method to make presentations at meetings we might not otherwise know about.

It was noted that it would be very good for all Work Group members to hear about feedback as it comes in from the various meetings/conferences and contacts that are made about the LC. Cy will add a Google doc and send the link to the Work Group where this kind of feedback can be captured. It was also noted that we should think about which advocacy groups might have concerns (e.g., information privacy groups, open data groups, etc.). Cy mentioned that we are straddling the fence here in terms of trying to keep certain information secure, but still shared between public bodies, however we aren't proposing public access for all this data. Advocacy groups on both sides might think we aren't going far enough.

5. NEXT STEPS – Sean and Cy

Subgroup will meet once or twice before the next Work Group meeting (currently scheduled for October 28) to discuss the additional changes to the draft LC suggested at the Work Group meeting and move forward on the communications action plan. They will also discuss draft LC changes to finalize with the Work Group at the next DSWG meeting.

Sean and Cy will revise the draft LC based on the discussion at the September 16 DSWG meeting and post that for review by the Work Group in the next couple of weeks. That version of the draft LC will be the one that, following the JLCIMT meeting on September 21, Sean plans to submit as sample language for Legislative Counsel drafting.

Each DSWG member will access the Google doc to post key people's names and meetings/conferences for communications purposes regarding the LC.

Cy and Sean will revise the slide deck for review and revision and post it to the website for the group members to use.

Cy will draft bulleted talking points on the LC for group members to use and will post to the website.

Cy will create a Google doc and send the link to the Work Group for capturing feedback on the LC and the various communications tools.

Sean, Cy and John Waffenschmidt will present to the JLCIMT on the draft LC. Sean will follow up as appropriate with Legislative Counsel to get the formal LC drafted.