

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

**Minutes**

Committee Members Present:

Andrew Lippstone, Office of the Governor, Chair  
Connie Holland, Office of State Planning, Director  
Karen Horton for Anas Ben Addi, Delaware State Housing Authority, Director  
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                                   | Kim Cloud, DTI   |
| David Edgell, OSPC                                 | Kevin Coyle, DNREC   |
| Bryan Hall, OSPC                                   | Matthew Laick, DSHS  |
| Kimberly Foster, OSPC                              | Mike Townshend, DNREC  |
| Laura Simmons, OSPC                                | Miriam Pomilio, OSPC   |
| Dorothy Morris, OSPC                               | Marti Dobson, DelDOT   |
| Sally Buttner, Energy Transition<br>Consulting LLC | Seth VanAken, ESRI<br>Jason Sealy, ESRI<br>Liana Edminston, ESRI |

I. Approval of Minutes

Following introductions, a motion was made by Sec. Bhatt to approve the draft minutes from the previous meeting of September 27, 2012. The motion was seconded by Terry Pepper and unanimously approved.

II. Oil Supply and Price – Delaware Ramifications

Next, Sally Buttner of Energy Transition Consulting, LLC made a presentation regarding the global supply and price of oil. This presentation was originally scheduled for the September 27 meeting but was postponed due to time constraints.

Ms. Buttner discussed that the oil supply in the United States would soon surpass that of Saudi Arabia but that does not mean there are not issues. The world's oil discovery peaked back in the 1960s, and at this time we are using more now than we are finding. Ms. Buttner continued to discuss the oil industry research that has been done around the world and what impacts oil demands could have on the United States and Delaware. Ms. Buttner presented slides that discussed her points.

Ms. Buttner explained that for Delaware's economy, for every \$2 increase in the price of gasoline, more than a billion dollars is going out from our economy. Ms. Buttner also discussed that agriculture would be very heavily impacted because farm machines are often powered by diesel fuel, foods move by diesel fuel, and chemicals are based on petrochemical products (pesticides/fertilizers). In addition, we would need more land to produce the food that we need because the decline in yield per acre and price increases could lead to food insecurity, especially for our poorer citizens.

In conclusion, Ms. Buttner recommended that Delaware develop a peak oil plan, and that developing a plan that would quickly identify the challenges and the vulnerabilities and

exposures. The plan might consider if motor fuels tax should be increased and if there are transportation and land use policies, public education could be involved in building a sense of community.

### III. GIS – Coordination of Path Forward and Next Steps

At its last meeting, the committee recommended that DTI further pursue ESRI's proposal regarding GIS data, but only to the extent that proposal would utilize the remaining credits available for use by the state under the the July 2010 Enterprise Licensing Agreement (ELA) between DTI and ESRI. The committee's recommendation was further contingent upon receipt from ESRI of an updated proposal that included specific timelines and deliverables. That information was provided by ESRI in October.

Mr. Lippstone stated that when he reviewed the revised proposal, it almost became less clear what the deliverables would be and who would be responsible for them. He further stated that the committee has no power to enter into an agreement with ESRI. All the committee can do is make recommendations to DTI, which has the statutory responsibility for entering into contracts in this area. Mr. Lippstone asked Mr. Hickox of DTI if he understood and was comfortable with the revised proposal's language regard deliverables and timeline.

Mr. Hickox stated that DTI does understand and is comfortable with the proposal, and DTI has the statutory authority to enter into an agreement with ESRI and to leverage the existing credits under the ELA. However, Mr. Hickox stated that because the contract is on behalf of the State, DTI wanted to ensure that all the agencies involved are comfortable with leveraging the balance of these credits for the centralized enterprise system. Members of the committee agreed that they are comfortable with using the existing credits for this purpose.

Mr. Hickox stated that DTI intends to continue to take a leadership role from an infrastructure perspective but they have partnered with the Office of State Planning Coordination on more of a functional lead to go forward until it is determined who will take overall responsibility.

In accordance with the above, it was agreed that ESRI and DTI should proceed with "Activity One" under the proposal using the existing credits under the ELA. Mr. VanAken of ESRI stated that once Activity One was completed and the System Architecture Design was delivered, ESRI would brief the committee on next steps.

Ms. Pomilio then briefed the committee about how much each agency spends on GIS related activities and how the state can consolidate to save money. Ms. Pomilio's findings were based on a survey she sent to most state agencies regarding their use of GIS. With respect to software costs, Ms. Pomilio noted that the ELA costs the state about \$406,000 annually. In addition, DelDOT uses additional GIS software at a cost of approximately \$34,000 per year. In addition, three agencies are using database management software.

Ms. Pomilio stated that, as per the survey results, the total cost for GIS software is approximately \$533,000 per year. However, hardware costs are more difficult to quantify because agencies often have multiple virtual servers for a variety of applications

running on individual pieces of hardware. That being said, the information provided by the agencies regarding hardware costs, specific to GIS use, was about \$486,000 a year.

Mr. Hickox explained that data storage is just part of the hardware costs. Servers are also used to produce and serve up the information. There are application servers and database servers; so there are multiple types of servers in a GIS system configuration.

Mr. Lippstone suggested working on the storage piece and determining how many terabytes of storage are dedicated to GIS related information. He requested that the agencies provide Ms. Pomilio with the best estimate of GIS storage space.

Ms. Pomilio discussed the other portion of this survey which looked at the number of GIS users and personnel costs associate with GIS use. DNREC is by far the biggest user of GIS data— about 330 users who spend about 25% of their time doing GIS work. DNREC estimated personnel costs at \$3.2 million per year for GIS purposes. Many agencies have between 1-100 employees that are actually “touching” GIS, with employee use ranging from 10% of employee time to 100%. Many agencies weren’t able to provide actual figures on personnel costs. Totaling the personnel information provided in this survey it was about 3.5 million per year. It was noted these personnel costs are just a base estimate.

Ms. Pomilio indicated she would continue to research the above information, and noted this survey was the “first cut.” Finally, Ms. Pomilio discussed the common GIS data that all state agencies have been sharing. This data is collected on a regular basis and it would be more cost effective to determine long term funding for these data sets. If the data collection was put on a planned schedule and all agencies shared the cost, the state could contract for the data collection as a bundle and possibly get a better price.

#### IV. Long-Term Strategy and Vision

Next, Mr. Lippstone handed out a copy of the statutory responsibilities of the committee. Since he has been chairman for about a year, Mr. Lippstone wanted to have an in depth discussion about what the Committee is supposed to do under Delaware law and what the committee members think it should be doing. A summary of the committee’s statutory responsibilities was distributed to members of the committee.

The committee has 5 broad categories of responsibilities. They are as follows:

1. *Responsibilities Under the Delaware Planning Act (Title 29, Chapter 91):* Mr. Lippstone stated that committee’s overall role is to serve in an advisory capacity to the Governor with respect to matters relating to the orderly growth and development of the state. Specifically, the committee is tasked with making recommendations regarding (a) the most desirable land use pattern within the state; (b) the major circulation pattern recommended for state, including major routes and terminals of transportation and communication facilities; and (c) major public works and facilities. In addition, the committee is responsible for reviewing and approving comprehensive plans (as described below) and preparing the Strategies for State Policies and Spending document and maps.
2. *Review and Approval of County Comprehensive Plans – Title 9, Chapter 26 (NCC), Chapter 49 (Kent) and Chapter 69 (Sussex):* The committee is charged with

reviewing and approving county comprehensive plans. Thanks to changes in the law last session, counties must submit updated comprehensive plans to the committee every 10 years; previously, it was every 5 years. The committee then discussed the statutory procedure for reviewing and approving such plans.

3. *Responsibilities With Respect to Municipalities:* With respect to municipalities, the committee no longer reviews municipal comprehensive plans. That function is handled by OSPC. In addition, the committee has certain responsibilities relating to municipal annexations.
4. *DNREC Actions Requiring Committee Approval:* In addition, there are certain DNREC actions that require committee approval, including approval of loans from the Safe Drinking Water Fund and agreements with the federal government, municipalities, state agencies or instrumentalities of the state to acquire property for park or recreation purposes.
5. *Administration of Certain Activities Under 21st Century Fund Investments Act:* The committee has certain managerial responsibilities for several accounts relating to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Fund, which was established in the mid-1990s. These accounts include, among others, the Neighborhood Housing Revitalization Account, Infrastructure Planning Account, and Drinking Water Management Account.

Having reviewed the statutory responsibilities, the following questions were posed to the committee:

- What does the committee do now that it could do better?
- What does the committee do now that it shouldn't be doing at all?
- What else should the committee be doing?

Mr. Lippstone asked the members of the committee to consider these questions and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting.

Mr. Lippstone asked if anyone else had comments or questions. Hearing none, a motion was made by Mr. Lippstone; seconded by Mr. Pepper and unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 pm.