

Table of Contents

- Introduction..... 1**
 - Scope 1
 - CPA Overview 1
 - History and Current Status 1
 - CPA Mission 3
 - CPA Goals..... 3
 - CPA Objectives..... 4
 - CPA Budget 4
- Partner Descriptions 7**
 - City of Eugene 7
 - EWEB..... 11
 - City of Springfield 13
 - Lane County 15
 - LCOG..... 17
- Methodology 19**
 - Benchmarking..... 19
 - Comparisons 19
- Member Profiles..... 24**
 - Existing LCOG Members and Private Agencies..... 24
- User Agency Tiers..... 30**
 - Existing Partners, LCOG Members and Private Agencies..... 30

Introduction

Scope

The objective of this GIS strategic planning initiative is to examine, define and restructure a long-standing multi-jurisdictional Cooperative Project Agreement (CPA) among partner agencies (the Partners), including the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB), Lane County and Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). The first step in this process is to document and describe the regional GIS ecosystem. This report will identify stakeholders in the strategic planning process, describe Partner Agency structure goals and objectives as detailed in strategic plans and other documentation and detail the databases of the Regional GIS Ecosystem, including partner and other regional agencies. The GIS Coordinators Committee, made up of GIS leads from the five Partners, oversees subcommittees and regularly reports to the Steering Committee. LCOG is the principal GIS service provider to the regional partnership, administering pooled funding, staffing and an annual work program. LCOG's GIS Program Manager is responsible for managing the CPA and coordinating regional GIS services including the Regional Land Information Database (RLID).

CPA Overview

History and Current Status

The RLID data warehouse, was established with a single IBM mainframe computer 40 years ago to support environmental planning in the Lane County area. As GIS technology and the regional data continued to improve, the partners saw new opportunities for the GIS and began expanding to other agencies. The original CPA was established in September, 2000, and created the Regional Executive Group (REG), a policy board comprised of the executives from the five partner agencies and overseeing a Regional Technology Partnership (RTP). Coordination and implementation of REG policies was performed by the Regional Information Officers (RIO), comprised the information system managers of the five partner agencies. The RTP was comprised of four service providers: Regional Information Systems (RIS run by Lane County), an Area Information Record System (AIRS

primarily administered by Lane County), a regional telephone consortium (run by LCOG), and a regional GIS system (run by LCOG). A body known as the Common Mapping Steering Committee (CMSC, later called the Regional GIS Steering Committee) was formed under the CPA to approve the annual regional GIS work plan, develop policies regarding shared GIS, and oversee the GIS Coordinators Committee (comprised of GIS coordinators from each agency). The GIS Coordinating Committee implemented these policies and directly managed staff performing the work involved in maintaining GIS systems at each agency. The regional GIS system is the only one of these service areas still in existence, and is overseen by the GIS Coordinating Committee. Of the executive groups, only the RIO and regional telephone consortium still exists and meets regularly. The other service areas (RIS, AIRS) no longer exist—at least not in original form, as do not the various governing and steering bodies (REG, CMSC).

The CPA has not been revisited in quite some time and has not kept pace with the changing needs, expectations, and local capabilities of either participating agencies nor other consumers of the RLID data and accompanying services. The governance structure that previously existed in the form of a steering committee has largely dissolved as a result of attrition, leadership changes and other conditions.

Historically, LCOG was the center of GIS in Lane County, but over time the needs of the partners have changed. This has resulted in a shift of interaction not only between LCOG and each partner, but also between the partner agencies themselves. The CPA partners interact with Esri as a group, and each partner also interacts with Esri independently. Shared data services exist, but each agency publishes their own services as well. Data acquisition and training is conducted at the group level and individually. There is a desire for more coordination in these efforts. As a result of this desire, LCOG and each of the partner agencies have agreed it is time to revisit the CPA and how each agency fits into it. Additionally, there may be opportunities for other agencies in the region to participate in the CPA. Each of the existing partners are amenable to this prospect and welcome additional discussion surrounding the topic.

Although RLID is only a piece of the CPA as a whole, its subscriber base provides for 42% of the total CPA budget as discussed in the budget section below. Additionally, all of the partner agencies

heavily rely on the CPA data warehouse and cannot effectively operate without it. Therefore, it is important to consider the data warehouse's current and future role in the CPA. In 2017, an online survey was distributed via Survey Monkey to all RLID customers to gauge satisfaction and other important feedback. About 487 people responded to the survey in total. Out of 487 respondents, 433 (89%) consider RLID to be very important or essential to their business. During this project, the data warehouse and its principal service suite, RLID, and how they are incorporated into the CPA will be evaluated and discussed amongst each of the partner agencies.

In summary, the objective of this project is to provide a strategy and structure for the CPA that is in close alignment with stakeholder needs, understanding that the existing CPA agreement is outdated and does not accurately represent the capabilities and needs of the Partners. The governance structure needs to be re-established and supported; the available products and services need to be thoroughly evaluated and clearly articulated; the membership, people, skills and other resourcing requirements must be determined; a mechanism for evaluating technology needs and decision-making needs to be developed; inbound and outbound interactions need to be stated, understood and documented; and, finally, a manageable and scalable funding model that balances partner interests, participation, and contribution must be designed and adopted.

CPA Mission

"To enable partner agencies to effectively share and make use of information, technologies and services."

CPA Goals

- Expand interconnectivity of local, state and federal networks
- Manage information and data as a resource
- Provide cost-effective shared-information services
- Expand access to network data and applications
- Support distributed processing using industry best practices for network architecture

- Ensure cost, quality, volume and availability of regional GIS services to partner agencies are consistent with regional and agency plans
- Minimize impact of system downtime on critical agency services
- Use the regional network as an integration point for diverse information technologies
- Maintain, extend and leverage the value of shared data
- Increase end-user access to data using vendor-supplied tools

CPA Objectives

- **Data**
 - Recognize CPA warehouse data as a regional asset to be developed, shared, maintained and defined for all
- **Organization**
 - Establish an effective multi-jurisdictional organization
- **Financing**
 - Establish a stable financial structure
- **Technology**
 - Ensure that adequate technology support is available to implement the regional GIS

CPA Budget

It is important to understand the current CPA budget and regional GIS partner contributions as part of the CPA restructuring project. LCOG GIS has two budget divisions that deal with GIS and partner contracts, the CPA which provides enterprise on-going GIS services, and Applied GIS which leverages the base data created to provide additional program and project services. Figure 1 on the following page details the budget and share of each partner from 2011 through the current fiscal year. An important item to note, the budget and share of each partner is being reviewed as part of this process.

The original share breakdown, as detailed in Figure 1, was based on agency capacity (residents, intersections, road miles, etc.) as a surrogate for use of the system. With GIS technology and activities now so widely distributed and the partner’s use of the system varying more and more, other options must be explored through this process. There are options available, such as service level agreements or pricing models, which are based on level of data contribution, level of use, or benefit from the system. As each agency is interviewed, ideas will be discussed that will provide for an equitable arrangement with recognition of the capabilities, roles and responsibilities of each agency.

	FY11/12 Budget	FY12/13 Budget	FY13/14 Budget	FY14/15 Budget	FY15/16 Budget	FY16/17 Budget	FY17/18 Budget	FY18/19 Proposed	CPA Cost Share (%)
Eugene	\$153,400	\$153,400	\$153,400	\$153,400	\$153,400	\$153,400	\$158,002	\$162,742	18.10
EWEB	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$76,285	\$78,573	8.74
Lane County	\$123,439	\$123,439	\$123,439	\$123,439	\$123,439	\$123,439	\$127,142	\$130,956	14.57
LCOG	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$74,063	\$76,285	\$78,573	8.74
Springfield	\$64,187	\$64,187	\$64,187	\$64,187	\$64,187	\$64,187	\$66,113	\$68,096	7.58
CPA Shares Subtotal	\$489,152	\$489,152	\$489,152	\$489,152	\$489,152	\$489,152	\$503,827	\$518,940	57.73
RLID Subscriber Revenue	\$283,500	\$292,000	\$295,000	\$310,000	\$321,998	\$326,000	\$346,000	\$380,000	42.27
Total Budget	\$772,652	\$781,152	\$784,152	\$799,152	\$811,150	\$815,152	\$849,827	\$898,940	100.00
Partner Agency COLA	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	

Notes
 CPA shares include annual reserve funding for regional hardware and software maintenance. Partner agency shares (excluding subscriber revenue) are approximately as follows: Eugene (32%), Lane County (25%), LCOG (15%), EWEB (15%), and Springfield (13%).
 RLID subscriber revenue is total annual amount collected from commercial and other non-partner agency users of the services accessed through the RLID web site.

Figure 1. Original breakdown of CPA partner budgets by year.

Currently, the CPA shares noted in Figure 1 come from the partners through the most aligned department. For some of the partners’ GIS departments, this is pass-through money in their budget and they may be responsible for determining cost allocations and collecting the funds from individual departments. This is not the ideal method for CPA budget allocation. During this project,

other methods will be explored to allow for simpler budget allocation and dissemination, possibly including recommendations to transition the CPA budget to an agency-wide expenditure.

As mentioned previously, the Applied GIS division within LCOG exists to provide contractual services to Partner and Member agencies as well as the private sector outside of what is offered under the CPA. LCOG leverages the skills, knowledge and datasets funded by the CPA to fund this suite of add-on contractual services. A small number of contracts with the State of Oregon and ad-hoc services are also held within this division.

Partner Descriptions

City of Eugene

“Value all people; encourage respect and appreciation for diversity, equity, justice and social well-being; recognize and appreciate our differences and embrace our common humanity as the source of our strength; be responsible stewards of our physical assets and natural resources, sustain our clean air and water, beautiful parks and open spaces, livable and safe neighborhoods; foster a vibrant downtown and stable infrastructure; encourage a strong, sustainable and vibrant economy; fully utilize our educational and cultural assets so that every person has an opportunity to achieve financial security”

Background

The city first developed a GIS strategic plan in July, 2000. In 2016, the public works department published a revised plan. GIS is managed by Eugene’s GIS Coordinating group (GISCO), composed of representatives from planning and development, public works, fire, police and other departments. GISCO meets on a monthly basis. The City of Eugene is one of the most active contracting agencies with LCOG as of the compilation of this report. The contracting noted here is LCOG budget division 207, not part of the CPA currently, although it is dependent upon and aligned with those activities.

The heaviest use of GIS comes from public works and planning and development. Staff in these departments use GeoDart (Geographical Data Analytical Retrieval Tool) or some other provision of GIS for their analytical or data inquiry needs. GeoDart runs as a toolbar in ArcGIS Desktop Basic, allowing users to quickly pull in desired data.

Goals and Initiatives

The City of Eugene has developed a list of goals and initiatives for 2018 and the desired outcomes.

A sample of these goals and initiatives are documented below:

- **Governance**

- Develop a city-wide GIS organizational structure
- Create a city-wide GIS Coordinator position
- Develop sustainable funding for the city-wide GIS program

- **Program Development**

- Provide user training
- Establish best practices for application development
- Promote value of GIS to other staff
- Develop GIS public website

- **Enterprise**

- Integrate GIS data with city business systems
- Migrate city data to city servers
- Enhance data maintenance and publication
- Develop GIS applications for external users
- Publish data, maps and apps to internal ArcGIS Portal site

Figure 2 aligns the 2018 initiatives with city-wide strategic goals and establishes a priority rating (H=high, M=medium, L=low) for each. To complete the project, some tasks will leverage the LCOG partnership while others will focus on in-house resources. This will be reviewed further during on-site interviews with the City of Eugene as part of this project

2018 Initiatives	Coordinate GIS activities across city departments/divisions	Migrate desktop users to new software products	Empower staff to work more efficiently and effectively	Acquire the necessary software, hardware and personnel	Implement an equitable distribution of GIS costs	Promote external use	Rating
Develop city-wide GIS governance structure	X		X		X		M
Establish GIS coordinator role	X		X			X	H
Develop sustainable funding	X			X	X		H
Provide user training				X			M
Establish app development best practices	X		X				L
Promote the value of GIS to city staff	X		X		X		H
Develop public GIS website	X					X	L

Figure 2.

2018 Initiatives	Coordinate GIS activities across city departments/divisions	Migrate desktop users to new software products	Empower staff to work more efficiently and effectively	Acquire the necessary software, hardware and personnel	Implement an equitable distribution of GIS costs	Promote external use	Rating
Integrate GIS data with city business systems	X			X			H
Migrate city data to city servers	X				X		L
Enhance data maintenance and publication	X			X		X	M
Develop GIS applications for external users		X	X	X		X	L
Publish data, maps and apps to internal ArcGIS Portal	X	X	X	X			M

Figure 2. (Continued) 2018 GIS Initiatives Aligned with City Strategic Goals.

EWEB

“To enhance our community's vitality; deliver drinking water and electric services consistent with the values of our customer-owners; inspire our customers to invest in and rely on us.”

Background

EWEB drafted an enterprise GIS plan in 2007, but the utility has since undergone major restructuring and the plan has been revised to reflect the organizational changes. While the 2007 plan may provide fair context, it does not align with the utility as it exists today, and there is no up-to-date documentation regarding the future of GIS.

EWEB was one of the founding members of the region's Common Mapping Project in the 1980s. In the mid-90s, EWEB upgraded from its little-known coordinate system and software package to ArcFM and other Esri tools. Due to ArcFM's compatibility and upgrade cycle, EWEB is typically a few Esri software release versions behind the current release. EWEB was one of the early agencies to pull out of the regional server system due to security needs and concerns. Currently, EWEB copies the entire RLID dataset to local servers on a weekly basis for use in various GIS applications.

Outside of the CPA, EWEB has leveraged LCOG services for an array of projects related to conservation, data creation and even non-GIS related analysis. For several years now, LCOG has been working on an easement data development project for EWEB which could be of benefit to many of the LCOG partners and member agencies once completed. A significant percentage of EWEB's staff are familiar with GIS and AutoCAD tools.

Goals and Initiatives

Stated in the 2007 GIS strategic plan and still true today, the following factors must be addressed to ensure a successful GIS program at EWEB:

- **Integration**

- New and existing systems must be made compatible with current GIS by leveraging information technology (IT) standards. EWEB is aiming to standardize their data model within GIS and move to more of a web services approach with integrations.

- **User development**

- The organization should be prepared to provide GIS training to personnel outside the bounds of a typical IT role. Going forward, IT skills should carry more weight as a hiring requirement for positions where GIS use is anticipated.

- **Support**

- The organization should follow up its effort to standardize the regional GIS platform by establishing a central GIS technical support group tasked with providing integrated GIS services and IT support to users.

- **Data management**

- Breaking up and consolidating the information silos that hinder effective data sharing will be a primary hurdle in realizing the benefits of enterprise GIS. A governing body should be formed to oversee and coordinate these efforts and establish enterprise business rules for managing data.

- **Governance**

- GIS decisions should be delegated to a steering committee, which would be responsible for monitoring progress on projects, establishing GIS work priorities and making policy decisions on standards, best practices and operating procedures. Additionally, a GIS working group should be established to provide technical direction and feedback for the steering committee and a GIS program coordinator should be brought in to support, guide and/or oversee the two.

City of Springfield

“Provide financially responsible and innovative government services; encourage economic development and revitalization through community partnerships; strengthen public safety; leverage partnerships and resources; maintain and improve infrastructure and facilities; foster an environment that values diversity and inclusion; promote and enhance our hometown feel; focus on livability and environmental quality”

Background

The City of Springfield does not currently have a GIS strategic plan but does have clearly defined roles and responsibilities detailed in an IT strategic plan and service level agreement (SLA) that defines the relationship between IT and public works regarding GIS. The plan is due for an update and some of the work plan projections may no longer be valid; however, most of the content is still relevant.

Included in the SLA is IT documentation on the GIS software applications supported within the department of public works (DPW), which include Autodesk, Esri’s ArcGIS Desktop (basic, standard and advanced) and MapSpring (city web mapping application). The IT GIS division also performs a number of functions related to data acquisition, data creation and data maintenance. On page 11 of the SLA, a number of data layers are listed that are under the direct stewardship of the GIS division and are supportive for functions of DPW. Conversely, several of the layers listed do not have a designated city steward, as the steward is LCOG. This is an example where the responsibilities of LCOG to provide this data should be documented in a newly formed CPA as well as an opportunity to link regionally shared responsibilities to Partner strategic plans, SLAs and similar organizational documents. This is representative of a training opportunity to educate staff on what is provided by LCOG as the steward.

From a city-wide support level, the IT city-wide SLA goes into detail regarding application and data support services for each department. Currently, LCOG does not perform a large amount of contract work (Applied GIS Division) with the City of Springfield. This type of work, if not performed in-house, is contracted out through other means. As part of the CPA, map and feature services for the City of Springfield are deployed via a server maintained and administered by LCOG.

Goals and Initiatives

Per the IT Strategic Plan, the IT department is committed to developing and embracing a set of guiding principles that will be employed as a set of parameters to govern the daily actions of the IT Department staff. The guiding principles are organized into nine categories including GIS, strategic partnerships, standardization, business performance, innovation, community impact and cyber security. The City of Springfield's GIS-specific goals and initiatives are as follows:

- **GIS as the Foundation**

- GIS will be used as a foundation for the implementation of location based technologies and applications.

- **GIS in the Business Review Process**

- Analysis of GIS solutions will be included as part of the business review process.

- **GIS Integration with Enterprise Systems**

- GIS will be used to enhance access to and analysis of enterprise data for city departments and citizens through online tools.

- **Central GIS Division**

- The GIS division will be the primary provider of professional mapping services to the city, thereby promoting both quality control and proper map production practices.

Lane County

Develop a self-sustaining enterprise GIS Program that provides our workforce and citizens easy access to information and tools in support of Lane County's mission."

Background

In February 2000, Lane County's Information Service Manager developed the Lane County GIS Strategic Plan. In November, 2013, the Information Services Department completely revised the plan to suit the organization in its current state. Shortly before the development of 2013 plan, Lane County's GIS Program was moved from the Public Works Department to the Information Services Department (now called the Technology Services Department), where it resides today. This occurred with the intention of allowing GIS to be more entrepreneurial and provide GIS services to all County departments more equally.

Lane County provides contract services to other agencies in the region, including tax lot maintenance, remapping of cadastral data, hosted mapping applications, data maintenance, and map requests for five other counties, the City of Cottage Grove, and the City of Creswell. Data for the cities is made available to LCOG so it can be shared via the regional data store. Additionally, there are some GIS and non-GIS coordination occurring between Lane County, the City of Eugene, the City of Springfield, and EWEB.

Goals and Initiatives

The Lane County GIS Strategic Plan (2013) established three major goals and initiatives for guiding the GIS program at Lane County. Lane County GIS has been fully integrated with the Lane County Technology Services Applications Division. As such, there is not a specific GIS Strategic Plan. A Strategic Plan does exist for the Technology Services Department. All of the goals outlined below have been met with the exception of refining the LCOG agreements, which are being addressed through this project.

- **Sustainable funding**

- Determine metrics for allocating GIS costs across county departments
- Review GIS fee schedule for services provided to the public
- Review LCOG GIS service costs and look for collaboration opportunities with other agencies
- Develop an imagery and LiDAR replacement fund and acquisition plan

- **Program development**

- Market GIS to internal and external customers
- Identify business processes that can benefit from GIS capabilities
- Educate and train users in GIS technology
- Refine LCOG agreements to ensure optimal use of GIS

- **Systems integration**

- Identify current informational needs that can be integrated with GIS
- Institute a process to ensure future systems are considered for integration with GIS

LCOG

“LCOG’s mission is to coordinate and provide high quality public services in Lane County. Lane Council of Governments is dedicated to serving the public interest and enhancing the quality of life for citizens of Lane County.”

Background

LCOG has a long tradition and history of managing and maintaining the regional GIS, dating back to 1974. As the primary caretaker, roles have included data creation, data maintenance, technology upgrades, software evaluation and upgrades and long range planning and coordination within a multi-jurisdictional environment. The regional GIS, since its inception, has evolved through a series of organizational constructs beginning with a centralized approach to providing regional GIS services. From 1974 to 1985, the regional GIS used a homegrown GIS known as Map Model. LCOG provided all the data development and maintenance for each partner agency as well as additional GIS services on an as needed basis. In 1975, the original CPA was established to provide for the ongoing care of GIS in the region. To this day, LCOG continues to manage and coordinate the annual CPA work plan.

Outside of the CPA, LCOG performs services and contract work with agencies, including but not limited to easement GIS data creation for EWEB and address data maintenance for Tillamook County. This contract work falls under the Applied GIS Division as noted earlier in this report.

Goals and Initiatives

- **Personnel**
 - GIS will be easy to use for all levels of LCOG staff
 - Communication, training and documentation to achieve optimal usage and satisfaction of the GIS will be made available to each agency

- **Organization**

- GIS will be cost-effective and affordable for LCOG
- LCOG will work toward building a unified GIS presence within the agency
- LCOG will pursue strategies which will support increased participation by LCOG programs to ensure stable and long-term funding
- Build partnerships with other agencies to meet LCOG's GIS needs
- The communication and organizational structure within the agency will foster data development and data sharing between program areas

- **Technology**

- GIS technology will be compatible with computing directions at the agency and regional level
- The GIS will meet the needs of the diverse customer base
- LCOG will establish the CPA data warehouse and its principal service suite, RLID, as its strategic direction for GIS

- **Data**

- Strategies and work plans will be adopted to achieve maximum integration of all GIS data within the agency and the region
- An inventory of regional and GIS data will be made available
- Information will be entered one time, at the time it is created

Methodology

Benchmarking

Benchmarking uses key performance indicators (KPIs) and other metrics to determine the maturity level of an organization, program, or product and is crucial to success. A component of this project is benchmarking LCOG and the CPA against standards and procedures identified as the optimal model or best practice in other organizations. During the on-site visits in August and October 2018, GTG will gather information on each Partner to support the benchmarking exercise. LCOG will then have the results of the benchmarking exercise which should be used for comparison as they progress in the years to come.

Comparisons

In the fall of 2014, Croswell-Schulte IT Consultants and Major Oak Consulting conducted a nationwide study of multi-organizational GIS programs. 38 organizations were included in the study which sought to gather information about their status, history and operating procedures. More than 80% of the organizations polled had GIS programs over 10 years old with an average tenure of 18 years. Only one organization reported a failure of their multi-organizational model due to funding issues – a testament to the strength of this model.

LCOG was noted in the report as the longest lasting example of this type of arrangement, in operation for over 40 years. Out of the organizations interviewed, LCOG was one of three organizations that noted participants from each of the organizations types presented. This includes federal government, county government, municipality, public utility, private utility, special service district, regional agency, state government agency, not-for-profit organization, university and private company (non-utility). Of the 20 multi-organizations interviewed, eight include members from universities and 14 include private or public utilities. This highlights the importance these types of organizations play into a successful regional GIS.

It is critical that we evaluate other agencies and what they have done to be successful regarding regional GIS as well as what has not worked for these agencies. This allows LCOG and each Partner agency to better understand the regional GIS ecosystem and how best to move forward as part of this restructuring project. We must not, however, ignore the importance of the each member agency and the potential to include additional Partners through this process. As noted previously, subscribers account for approximately 42% of the overall budget for the CPA. Additional members and Partners will allow LCOG to better serve its user base across the entire community. To effectively benchmark LCOG against other regional COGs, we must first develop KPIs and then move into leveraging benchmarking standards, such as the GIS Capability Maturity Model. The steps for this process are included below.

KPIs

The first task is to establish a baseline of GIS capability to enable the organization to develop an understanding of program strengths and weaknesses and gain insight on how GIS is implemented and operated. This baseline will serve as a tool for future enterprise-GIS development, helping to funnel resources and focus efforts towards areas that will generate the most value.

GTG has developed several methods for benchmarking, including the six pillars of GIS success (governance, data and databases, software, training and education, system architecture and procedures, workflow and integration) and our GIS SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats). During the on-site visit in October, GTG will be performing a SWOT analysis workshop with each Partner agency as a component of the benchmarking exercise.

Capability Maturity Modeling

Following the collection and compilation of the KPI and SWOT results, GTG will leverage benchmarking standards from the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association's (URISA) GIS Capability Maturity Model for this study.

The Capability Maturity Model provides a framework that:

- **Identifies the characteristics of a capable enterprise-GIS**
- **Identifies characteristics of a well-managed enterprise-GIS**
- **Determines an organization's maturity status**
- **Identifies current strengths and challenges**

Although not always an exact fit for municipal organizations, URISA's model can be tailored to fit a regional partnership such as the LCOG/CPA relationship.

Capability maturity models have been used in a number of industries and typically identify and analyze various components of maturity and success. The maturity model will look at various LCOG/CPA components based on the following stages:

- **Level 1 (Ad hoc/chaotic processes)**
 - Typically in reaction to a need to get something done.
- **Level 2 (Repeatable processes)**
 - Typically based on recalling and repeating how the process was done the last time.
- **Level 3 (Defined processes)**
 - The process is written down (documented) and serves to guide consistent performance within the organization.
- **Level 4 (Managed processes)**
 - The documented process is measured when performed and the measurements are compiled for analysis. Changing system conditions are managed by adapting the defined process to meet the conditions.
- **Level 5 (Optimized processes)**
 - The defined and managed process is improved on an on-going basis by institutionalized process improvement planning and implementation. Optimization may be tied to quantified performance goals.

Scoring

It is important to consider the capabilities of the ideal enterprise-GIS in theoretical terms and then analyze and measure an individual operation against this ideal. Each key GIS capability or element will be scored using the following rubric:

- **1.00** - Fully implemented
- **0.80** - In progress; full resources available to achieve capability
- **0.60** - In progress; only partial resources available to achieve capability
- **0.40** – Planned; resources available to achieve capability
- **0.20** – Planned; no resources available to achieve capability
- **0.00** – Desired; no resources and not planned
- Not applicable

Standards

The purpose of this modelling exercise is to gauge LCOG and the CPA against a variety of standards including:

- A theoretical ideal end state of GIS organizational development
- The maturity level of other peer GIS organizations, either individually or in aggregate
- The maturity level of LCOG and the CPA over time
- The maturity level of the organization against an agreed target state (perhaps set by organizational policy, budget limitations, etc.)

Results

The results will be presented in logical groupings comprising the following:

- **Focus area**
 - A specific capability or grouping of capabilities that were analyzed (i.e. framework GIS data, business GIS data and data maintenance)
- **Capability type**
 - Enabling or execution capability described above
- **Assessment ranking**
 - How each capability was scored
- **Importance**
 - Priority level of the capability to the organization
- **Comparator results**
 - Table of information on how other key organizations are handling comparable capabilities
- **Analysis and recommendations**
 - What the results tell us and recommendations including identification of improvement areas in which to focus resources and investment

Member Profiles

Existing LCOG Members and Private Agencies

Given recent trends in the Oregon Geographic Information Council and the Framework Implementation Team structure for developing and organizing state-wide geographic data and stewarding the funding of such data and LCOG's contractual involvement with State agencies for developing programmatic data standardization and extraction processes, relationships with peer council of government's such as Oregon Cascades West COG (OCWCOG) and Mid-Willamette Valley COG (MWVCOG) are increasingly important and will be considered for future opportunities. As previously noted, new members and Partners are considered critical to the on-going success of the regional GIS. This will include universities, federal and state government, public and private utilities and more. Through the benchmarking exercise, we will identify what types of organizations participate in other COG environments. This will provide LCOG insight into what is working for similar organizations. As a point of reference, the following table highlights existing LCOG Members and Private Agencies.

Stakeholder Organization (Linked to web)	Basic Purpose	Key Executive	Address
<u>Central Lane Communication Center</u>	Communications gateway for regional emergency services for the greater Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area and a major portion of rural Lane County.	Pam Collett	1735 W 2nd Ave, Eugene, OR 97402
<u>City of Coburg</u>	As a unique and welcoming community, Coburg sustains the heart and soul of its rich traditions, while continuously embracing its exciting future.	Ray Smith	91136 N Willamette St., PO Box 8316, Coburg, OR 97408
<u>City of Cottage Grove</u>	"Our mission is to foster community partnerships, projects and priorities that create a favorable climate for economic and employment growth."	Jeff Gowing	337 N. 9th St, Cottage Grove, Oregon 97424
<u>City of Creswell</u>	Creswell will continue to be a friendly place where people want to live and work.	Dave Stram	13 South 1st St., PO Box 276, Creswell, OR 97426
<u>City of Eugene</u>	Headquarters of the City of Eugene's administration	Lucy Vinis	125 East 8th Ave., 2nd Floor, Eugene, OR 97401
<u>City of Florence</u>	Headquarters of the City of Florence's administration	Erin Reynolds	250 Highway 101, Florence, OR 97439
<u>City of Junction City</u>	We provide a quality lifestyle that you would expect in a full service community.	Mark Crenshaw	680 Greenwood, PO Box 250, Junction City, OR 97448
<u>City of Lowell</u>	Headquarters of the City of Lowell's administration	Jared Cobb	107 E. 3rd St., PO Box 490, Lowell, OR 97452

Stakeholder Organization (Linked to web)	Basic Purpose	Key Executive	Address
City of Oakridge	The City of Oakridge is a beautiful area, surrounded by the vast Willamette National Forest, where families and businesses live and grow, work and play, live and dream, in a safe and sustainable community.	Judy Rowland	PO Box 1410, Oakridge, OR 97463
City of Springfield	Headquarters of the City of Springfield's administration	Christine Lundberg	225 Fifth St., Springfield, OR 97477
City of Veneta	A comfortable commute from the metropolitan area, Veneta is in relatively close proximity to shopping, services and jobs in west Eugene.	Sandra Larson	88184 8th St., Veneta, OR 97487
City of Westfir	Headquarters of the City of Westfir's administration	Matt Meske	47441 Westoak Rd, PO Box 296, Westfir, OR 97492
Emerald Peoples' Utility District	To provide safe, reliable, low-cost power in an environmentally responsible manner.	Kevin Parrish	33733 Seavey Loop Rd., Eugene, OR 87405
Eugene-Emergency Management	Increasing our overall disaster resilience is the responsibility of every community member. By providing tools and resources to our community members, we are working toward one goal—overall disaster preparedness.	Kevin Holman	940 Willamette St., Suite 200, Eugene, OR 97401
Eugene Springfield Fire	Our mission is to serve our communities by protecting life, preserving property and the environment through prevention, education, rescue, fire suppression and emergency medical services.	Joe Zaludek	1705 W Second Ave., Eugene, OR 97402 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, 97477

Stakeholder Organization (Linked to web)	Basic Purpose	Key Executive	Address
Eugene Water and Electric Board	We provide water and electricity to the Eugene community, as well as parts of east Springfield and the McKenzie River valley area.	Frank Lawson	500 East Fourth Ave., Eugene OR 97401
Heceta Water PUD	Water utility company in Lane County, Oregon	Carl Neville	87845 US-101, Florence, OR 97439
Junction City fire	Our mission at the Junction City Fire Department, is to dedicate ourselves to providing the most effective fire protection and emergency services to our community and its citizens!	Brandon Nicol	1755 Juniper Street Junction City, OR 97448
Lane Community College	Lane is the community's college: we provide comprehensive, accessible, quality, learning-centered educational opportunities that promote student success	Margaret Hamilton	4000 East 30th Ave., Eugene, Oregon 97405
Lane Council of Governments	Lane Council of Governments is a one-stop destination for services to the Lane County region and beyond.	Howard Schussler	859 Willamette St., Suite 500, Eugene, OR 97401
Lane County	The Board of County Commissioners legislates and administers County government within the limits of its authority granted in the Lane County Home Rule Charter.	Gary Williams	125 East 8th Ave., Eugene, OR 97401
Lane Electric Cooperative	As a rural electricity distribution cooperative, Lane Electric's primary mission is to provide safe, reliable and economical electric service to its member/owners in rural Lane County.	Susan Knudsen Obermeyer	787 Bailey Hill Rd., Eugene, OR 97402

Stakeholder Organization (Linked to web)	Basic Purpose	Key Executive	Address
Lane Fire Defense Board	We strive to provide the highest level of services that improve the quality of life, health and safety of all we meet.	Terry Ney	PO Box 398, 88050 Territorial Highway, Veneta, OR 97487
Lane Transit District	We work with many partners, from city, county and state agencies, schools, chambers of commerce and area employers to provide transportation services that improve the quality of life in our community.	Collina Beard	3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene, OR 97403
Port of Siuslaw	Delivers high-quality asset management and economic development services that result in measurable economic and community development benefits for communities throughout the Port District.	Terry Duman	100 Harbor St., Florence, OR 97439
Public Safety Coordinating Council	The Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) is a regional advisory council for the Board of County Commissioners. The PSCC is charged with ensuring every effort is taken to effectively use resources to prevent crime, reduce crime, and increase the sense of safety within the community.	Paul Solomon	1424 Oak Patch Rd., Eugene OR 97403
River Road PRD	Provides community-based residential treatment program for males ages 12 to 25.	Kirstin London	550 River Road – Eugene, OR 97404
SD - Bethel School District 52	Bethel is a growing school district in northwest Eugene that is home to approximately 5,600 students.	Chris Parra	4640 Barger Drive, Eugene, OR 97402
SD - Eugene School District 4J	Eugene School District 4J is a K–12 public school district in and around Eugene, Oregon.	Gustavo Balderas	200 North Monroe St., Eugene, Oregon 97402

Stakeholder Organization (Linked to web)	Basic Purpose	Key Executive	Address
<u>SD - School District 40 Creswell</u>	Serves nearly 1,300 students in grades K-12.	Todd Hamilton	998 West A. St., Creswell, OR 97426
<u>SD - School District 45J3 South Lane</u>	Establishes the rules that govern the schools consistent with state and federal laws.	Sherry Duerst-Higgins	455 Adams Ave., Cottage Grove, OR 97424
<u>SD- School District 68 McKenzie</u>	Enrolls students in K-12 and serves all students on one campus.	James Rudisill	51187 Blue River Dr., Finn Rock, OR 97488
<u>SD - Springfield School District 19</u>	In addition to the dedicated staff out in the schools, our district-level departments are staffed with friendly and helpful people who pay the bills, keep the buses rolling and make sure the students get fed.	Bruce Smolnisky	640 A St., Springfield, OR 97477
<u>Siuslaw Valley Fire</u>	Serves community and visitors through safe, efficient and effective delivery of emergency services supported by aggressive fire prevention and public education.	Steve Abel	2625 US 101, Florence, OR 97439
<u>University of Oregon</u>	We strive for excellence in teaching, research, artistic expression and the generation, dissemination, preservation and application of knowledge.	Michael H. Schill	1585 E 13th Ave., Eugene, OR 97403
<u>Western Lane Ambulance District</u>	We strive to provide the highest level of patient care possible and have been recognized by the State of Oregon for outstanding service to the community with over a half dozen awards for excellence.	Matt House	410 9th St., PO Box 2690, Florence, OR 97439
<u>Willamalane Park and Recreation District</u>	We make it our mission to deliver exceptional parks and recreation to enrich the lives of everyone we serve.	Michael Wargo	250 S 32nd St., Springfield, OR

User Agency Tiers

Existing Partners, LCOG Members and Private Agencies

The following table provides an overview of the number of users within each Partner Agency or LCOG Member or Private Agency. As outlined below, each user is categorized within one of three tiers, ranging from senior policy makers to technical GIS managers and specialists to data users, browsers and subscribers. This breakdown provides perspective into the user base that makes up the current LCOG community.

- **Tier 1**
 - Senior policy makers (Partners)
- **Tier 2**
 - Technical GIS Managers and specialists (Partners)
- **Tier 3**
 - Data users, browsers and subscribers (Partners, LCOG members, private)

Partner Agency	Tier 1	Tier1.5	Tier 2	Tier 2.5	Tier 3	Total
City of Eugene	1	2	5	20	6	34
City of Springfield	1	2	1	7	10	21
Eugene Water & Electric Board	1	1	4	8	0	14
Lane Council of Governments	1	1	3	12	1	18
Lane County	2	1	2	14	4	23
TOTAL	6	7	15	61	21	110

Partner Agency	Tier 1	Tier1.5	Tier 2	Tier 2.5	Tier 3	Total
Bethel School District 52	-	-	0	0	1	1
Central Lane Com. Center	-	-	0	1	0	1
City of Coburg	-	-	0	0	1	1
City of Cottage Grove	-	-	0	0	1	1
City of Creswell	-	-	0	0	1	1
City of Florence	-	-	0	0	4	4
City of Oakridge	-	-	0	0	1	1
City of Veneta	-	-	0	0	1	1
Emerald Peoples' Utility	-	-	0	0	1	1
Eugene Emergency MGMT.	-	-	0	1	0	1
Eugene Risk Services	-	-	0	1	0	1
Eugene School District 4J	-	-	0	0	1	1
Eugene/Springfield Fire	-	-	1	0	0	1
Greater Eugene Inc.	-	-	0	0	1	1
Junction City	-	-	0	0	2	2
Lane Community College	-	-	0	0	1	1
Lane Electric Cooperative	-	-	0	0	1	1
Lane Fire Defense Board	-	-	0	0	1	1
Lane Transit District	-	-	0	0	1	1
Public Safety Coord. Council	-	-	0	0	1	1
Siuslaw Valley Fire	-	-	0	0	1	1
Springfield School District 19	-	-	0	0	1	1
University of Oregon	-	-	0	0	1	1
Williamalane Parks & Rec	-	-	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	6	7	15	61	11	100