

**Cabinet Committee on State Planning Issues  
Haslett Armory, Room 219  
September 27, 2012**

**Meeting Summary**

Committee Members Present:

Andrew Lippstone, Office of the Governor, Chair  
Connie Holland, Office of State Planning, Director  
Anas Ben Addi, Delaware State Housing Authority, Director  
David Small for Secretary Collin O'Mara, Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control  
Shailen Bhatt, Secretary, Delaware Department of Transportation  
Karen Field Rogers for Secretary Mark Murphy, Department of Education  
Terry Pepper for Secretary Lewis Schiliro, Department of Safety and Homeland Security  
Bill Hickox for Director Jim Sills, Department of Technology and Information  
Leighann Hinkle for Director Ann Visalli, Office of Management and Budget

Also Present:

Herb Inden, OSPC	Kevin Coyle, DNREC
David Edgell, OSPC	Matthew Laick, DSHS
Bryan Hall, OSPC	Mike Townshend, DNREC
Kimberly Foster, OSPC	David Bennett, DTI
Laura Simmons, OSPC	Miriam Pomilio, OSPC
Dorothy Morris, OSPC	Marti Dobson, DelDOT
Sarah (Sally) Buttner, Energy Transition Consulting LLC	Seth VanAken, ESRI
	Jason Sealy, ESRI

The Cabinet Committee on State Planning Issues (CCSPI) met September 27, 2012 in room 219 of the Haslett Armory in Dover. The Committee met to discuss items set forth on the posted agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 by chairman Andrew Lippstone, followed by a welcome and introductions.

**Approval of May 15, 2012 meeting minutes**

A Motion was made by Mr. Lippstone and seconded by Terry Pepper to approve the May 15, 2012 meeting minutes. Voting was unanimous and minutes from May 15, 2012 were approved as written.

**Draft Annual Report to the Governor**

Herb Inden of the Office of State Planning Coordination presented the draft of the Committee's 2012 Annual Report. Among other things, the Annual Report details the investments made by the state in support of sound planning practices; summarizes the progress made in connection with land use initiatives; describes the comprehensive planning efforts made by county and municipal governments; and summarizes recent trends in land use changes statewide. Mr. Inden provided an overview of the major components of the Annual Report.

Following comments, Connie Holland asked all Committee members to review the Annual Report in detail and contact her if they had any questions. Mr. Lippstone requested that members provide comments no later than October 8.

## **Discussion of Path Forward for GIS Coordination**

Mr. Lippstone stated that the Committee was prepared to consider and discuss Esri's proposal to provide consulting services in connection with the consolidation of GIS services across state agencies. Before doing so, however, he stated that it would first be useful to summarize the Committee's work on this issue to date.

### *What Is the Problem the Committee Is Trying to Address?*

Mr. Lippstone noted that the Committee first began discussing ways to consolidate GIS data across agencies in August 2011. In February 2012, Director Jim Sills made a presentation to the Committee in which he noted the following:

- Six state agencies have their own GIS infrastructure.
- Approximately 60-70% of the data in these agencies is the same or similar to data in other agencies. This results in inefficiencies, both in terms of storage space (the state has about 15-20 TB of data) and operational efficiency (agencies can't find data, especially in other agencies).

Following Director Sills' presentation at that meeting, the Committee discussed the potential benefits of a coordinated and centralized GIS system, which include reducing data storage from 15-20 TB to approximately 10-12 TB. Members of the Committee noted that this could result in savings of approximately \$1 million per year on hardware (storage costs), as well software savings in an amount to be determined.

Mr. Lippstone noted that in recent meetings, the parties have been unable to provide detailed information regarding the actual amount of savings that would result from a move to a more coordinated GIS system. That said, he noted that a coordinated and consolidated GIS data system could have benefits in terms of government efficiency.

### *What Has Been Done to Date?*

Mr. Lippstone stated that in spring 2012, Esri—which has an existing contract with the state—conducted free workshops with 4 agencies (DSHS, DTI, DNREC, DeIDOT) to determine generally the strengths and weaknesses of the GIS system and the needs of state agencies. Esri presented its findings at the May 2012 meeting of this Committee. At that meeting, Esri noted that several common issues had emerged, including the following:

- Agencies sometimes rely on other departments for accurate GIS data, and they often don't receive that data in a timely way.
- Agencies sometimes have difficulty locating authoritative data.
- There is a significant amount of data redundancy in the above agencies.
- Several agencies stated the need for a standard basemap.

At the May 2012 meeting, Esri discussed a proposed concept for GIS: a “geospatial platform with web-oriented architecture.” In plain language, this means a system that:

- Is web-based, in which users share a common portal with a common interface.
- Reduces redundancy – users enter data once, and that data can be accessed with other state users who have the appropriate clearances.
- Is built in an enterprise fashion, meaning that it gets built incrementally over time.

In furtherance of this concept, Esri described several recommended activities, including data management (*i.e.*, identifying and removing overlapping or incorrect GIS data);

implementing a GIS portal; creating an appropriate governance structure; and modernizing the Delaware Geographic Data Committee. At the May 2012 meeting, the Committee asked for 3 things:

1. A final proposal from Esri on the scope of services they propose to deliver;
2. A detailed description of the cost of such proposal; and
3. A detailed business case for GIS coordination from OSPC, including a summary of costs, benefits and potential efficiencies to be realized.

*Proposed Scope of Services and Costs*

Following the above discussion, Seth VanAken presented Esri's proposal – titled “EEAP Consulting Services—Discovery Workshop Activities Support for the State of Delaware”—and the costs thereof. The proposal is divided into three phases, which include creating an infrastructure to support an online GIS site (Phase I); configuring the online GIS site (Phase II) and creating map products that align with business opportunities (Phase III).

Under the proposal, Esri would provide consulting services in connection with two main activities. In Activity One, Data Management, Esri would assist in identifying and organizing existing GIS data; setting up a centralized data repository; and determining how to best consolidate (and eventually share) information. In Activity Two, it would assist in the actual implementation of the online portal.

The cost of the proposal is expressed in terms of “credits,” which are units of support time allocated by Esri under its existing Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with DTI. According to Mr. VanAken, one credit is equal to two consulting hours. As explained by Bill Hickox, the existing three-year ELA (effective July 2010) requires the state to pay Esri \$400,000 per year. In addition to software licensing, the ELA entitles DTI, on behalf of the state, to 350 credits. Mr. Hickox noted that the state has approximately 150 credits remaining under the existing ELA.

Mr. VanAken explained that Esri's activities in support of Phase I of the proposal would be 402 hours total, or 201 credits. Thus, the state could use the approximately 150 credits remaining under the ELA, but it would still need approximately 50 credits to complete Phase One. This prompted several questions from the Committee:

- Secretary Bhatt and others asked how the state would make up the above credit shortfall if it pursues the proposal. Mr. VanAken noted that blocks of credits may be purchased at a rate of \$47,000 per 100 credits. Alternatively, Mr. Hickox noted that the existing ELA is due to expire at the end of June 2013. To the extent the state renews with Esri, the remaining credits could be renegotiated and folded into the new agreement. Members of the Committee agreed that it would be inappropriate to discuss the potential terms and conditions of a revised ELA with members of Esri present, and at any rate, the Committee has no power to negotiate such agreements.
- Several members asked what the remaining 150 credits would be used for if they are not used for this project. Mr. Hickox stated that the credits will be used for training and other projects, although there are no major projects being contemplated at this time that would use such credits.

- Mr. VanAken that the credits are for services only and do not include necessary hardware for this project. However, it was discussed and brought up that no agency will pay more than they would pay for equal services. For example, if DelDOT pays \$10,000 per year for their GIS information, within this plan they will not pay more than that \$10,000. Individual departments are already paying for system architecture and would continue to pay for price of overall consolidation.
- Mr. Lippstone asked if the 150 remaining credits are used, but the remaining 50 or so credits are not available, what will have been accomplished by using those credits for this project? Mr. VanAken replied that 150 credits are sufficient to complete Activity One.
- Secretary Bhatt asked question about what the cost per phase would be for Phases II and III. Mr. VanAken did not have dollar figure present but stated they will release this figure once they have it. Mr. Hickox stated that at this point the state can move forward to determine total cost, however, if this project becomes too cost prohibitive then it is possible to stop at that point.
- Secretary Bhatt asked what the next steps would be if the project were approved. Mr. VanAken replied that Esri would begin onsite visits and gathering information upon receiving the appropriate approvals. He also asked what the time commitment would be for each agency in connection with the initial phase of this project. Mr. VanAken stated that the time commitment will be approximately one and a half days for each agency.
- Secretary Bhatt also asked when Activity One would be completed. In response, Mr. VanAken stated that he did not have a precise date, but would work to develop that information and provide it to the Committee. Secretary Bhatt also requested a detailed timeline and list of deliverables, which Mr. VanAken promised to provide. Mr. Lippstone expressed concern that Esri was supposed to provide additional information to the Committee within two weeks of the last meeting, but did not deliver that information in a timely manner. Mr. VanAken assured the Committee that the remaining information would be provided in a timely way.

Prior to action by the Committee, Mr. Lippstone summarized what powers the Committee has and does not have under Delaware law with respect to the proposal. Generally speaking, the Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Governor, and considers matters relating to orderly growth and development. Mr. Lippstone further stated that the Committee has no power to enter into GIS or other technology agreements, and has no authority to require any other agency to enter such agreements. Generally, DTI is the state agency that is charged with coordinating information technology efforts undertaken by state agencies, and it has the authority to enter into contracts with private entities in connection with those efforts.

Mr. Lippstone made a motion to recommend to DTI that it authorize Esri to begin work on the proposal, but only to the extent such work uses the remaining credits under the existing ELA (approximately 150 credits). The motion was conditioned upon Esri providing the Committee a detailed timeline and list of deliverables no later than two (2)

weeks from the date of the meeting. Mr. Pepper seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

#### *Revised GIS Business Plan*

In connection with the above, Miriam Pomilio of the Office of State Planning presented the highlights of the “Revised Business Plan for Geospatial Coordination for Delaware State Government.” The Revised Plan was prepared in August by OSPC with input from GIS professionals from DNREC, DeIDOT, DSHS and DTI. A copy of the Revised Plan was distributed to members of the Committee in advance of the meeting.

As explained by Ms. Pomilio, the Revised Plan set forth a business case for GIS consolidation and describes the benefits of a coordinated approach. The Revised Plan notes that the state has made significant investments in GIS technology in recent years, with more than \$3.7 million spent on just four major initiatives since 2004. Ms. Pomilio stated that with such a high level of spending, the state’s investments should be coordinated to maximize efficiencies.

Ms. Pomilio stated that the Revised Plan identifies several examples of how coordination and shared resources could save the state money. For instance, in 2008, the Delaware Coastal Program performed a return of investment study that documented close to \$1 million of program savings emanating from their access to shared orthoimagery services. Mr. Lippstone stated that it would be helpful to know what each agency spends on GIS data and services, as a means for determining what could be saved under a more coordinated system.

Ms. Pomilio noted that the Revised Plan stresses the importance of a centralized governance structure, and to that end proposes creating a Geospatial Coordination Team and Geospatial Coordinator under the auspices of the Office of State Planning. If enacted, the proposal would entail reallocation or reassignment of existing positions and would involve no new positions. Mr. Lippstone expressed concerns and reservations about the creation of a new office, and noted that such an office may well be outside of OSPC’s statutory purview. Ms. Holland and Ms. Pomilio noted that the proposal is merely a working proposal, representing the first step in thinking about how geospatial information should be coordinated at the state level. They noted that there are many discussions still to come.

#### **Oil Supply and Price - Delaware Ramifications** **Sally Buttner, Energy Transition Consulting, LLC**

This agenda item was tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints and members needed to leave. Ms. Buttner will present as first agenda item during the next quarterly meeting.

A motion was made by Terry Pepper, seconded by Dave Small and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:31 pm.

The next meeting of the Cabinet Committee on State Planning Issues is set for Tuesday, November 27, 2012 at 2:00 in room 219 of the Haslet Armory in Dover.