

Meeting Notes

from the

Data Sharing Partnership Meeting

Conducted at the La Grande Fire Station

October 11, 2006

This was the first of six Data Sharing Partnership meetings held around the state of Oregon on behalf of the Association of Oregon Counties and the Oregon Geographic Information Council. The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Present the data sharing concept and rationale to local government officials
- Identify issues, concerns, items of key interest from meeting attendees
- Document the findings from the meeting and share information and ideas

What the Data Sharing Partnership Should or Should NOT Be

- Development of a shared base of standardized data
- Consistent minimum level of technology for all data producers
- Involvement of cities, as well as counties
- Availability of consistent, long-term funding for data maintenance
- A central location where data can be sent by local govt. in existing formats to be reconfigured or translated to one consistent structure
- An agreement written in stone that assures provisions will be honored
- Must not reduce current funding or revenue streams associated with data
- Shouldn't add work for local governments
- Expectations must be managed carefully – holes will exist for the time being where counties or cities don't want to participate
- All stakeholders, especially local govt., must have adequate representation in administration of partnership

Barriers

- Inventory of existing data and expenditures for data development aren't available
- Funding for data development and maintenance is insufficient
- Communication and coordination statewide is inadequate
- There is no complete list of potential partners
- Some won't want to participate
- County departments don't always work well together and often don't know what data other departments in the same county have or need
- Many rural counties, particularly east of the Cascades, don't have GIS staff and don't place a high priority on data maintenance
- Data producers (local govts.) will see little of the money saved by data sharing

Opportunities

- Increased efficiency in data development – elimination or reduction of duplicated effort
- Involvement of all partners will result in more complete data, thus better decisions
- Better coordination among partners will enable better services for the citizens
- Partnership would help focus resources more effectively
 - Specific example: When county and city roads linework is shared with ODOT, ODOT can attach accident data for those roads to the linework and send it back to the county and city.
 - Specific example: Twelve percent of Umatilla County roads are on tribal lands. If data sharing partnership is in place, tribes would share road data and county wouldn't have to develop it for tribal land.
 - Specific example: State has developed a web application that enables developers to purchase permits electronically from local jurisdictions if base address data is available from those jurisdictions. Successful pilot program exists in several jurisdictions now.

Concerns

The proposed management structure for the partnership may not be effective, particularly if it becomes another layer of bureaucracy or administration.

There may not be sufficient incentives for data producers.

There may be liability or risk associated with data sharing.

Local governments don't want outside sources telling them how or when to conduct their business.

Revenue streams for data development and maintenance, either existing or proposed, may go away.

Data may be used in ways that are not agreed upon, particularly to enforce state or federal regulations.

There may be unintended consequences of having more and better data, such as causing increased workload for local governments to answer questions or otherwise support citizens and businesses using the data.

More funding for tasks not associated with local business processes is not really what local governments want or need.

There are usually strings attached to federal dollars that might be used to fund data development.

If base data is a subset of existing local government databases, extracting that base data may be costly and local governments can't bear that cost.

The following questions need to be answered:

Who are the players?

What data needs to be shared?

What are the incentives?

How is the data exchanged?

How is the data marketed?

Who owns the data?

How is the data put in the hands of decision makers?

How is analysis of data requirements being done?

Actions or Ideas for Next Steps

Separating the partnership activities in to three steps or actions might make sense:

- Administration – A number of comments were made that there is a need for a hub of coordination and communication that administers the partnership.
- Funding - Many noted that funding is a critical need and that there will probably be a greater need for funding on the east side of the state initially to bring local governments up to speed. May want to either consider the partnership as already funded, or characterize as ‘contingent on funding’, in order to get past the funding issue for now.
- Development – This is about development of the partnership coordination and communication, as well as development of the data and technology in a consistent way across the state.

Finding the right incentives for each participant will be challenging. Those incentives may be different for each jurisdiction.

Better communication must start immediately. Other stakeholders must be brought in to discussion. AOC and LOC don’t speak for all stakeholders.

An inventory of existing data and past expenditures by local governments must be developed.

Predicted cost of data and technology development must be estimated.

Local government officials must be educated as to the rationale, benefits, and need for this partnership.

Participants in La Grande Meeting

Denise Williams, Morrow Co.
Dan Haug, Confederated Tribes of Umatilla
Tycho Granville, Wasco Co.
Scott Hartell, Union Co.
Shawn Berry, Baker Co.
Dawn Smith, Wallowa Co. GIS
Jim Kimberling, Malheur Co.
Chad Brady, ODOT
Paul Chalmers, Umatilla Co. Assessor
Tracie Diehl, Umatilla Co. GIS

Jeanne Gorham, Umatilla Co. Road Dept.
Mark Kinslow, Dept. of Revenue
Linda Hill, Union Co. Assessor
Tom Davis, City of Ontario
Michelle Kooch, Malheur Co. GIS
Dan R. DeBoie, Wallowa Co. Commissioner
David Messenger, Gilliam Co.
Colleen MacLeod, Union Co. Commissioner
Cy Smith, Dept. of Administrative Services