

Data Sharing Partnership Meetings Round 1 Summary

This is a summary of the meeting notes from all six of the Data Sharing Partnership Round 1 meetings, held in La Grande, Tillamook, Medford, Prineville, Eugene, and Portland. Where the same or similar input was received in more than one meeting, the number after the comment indicates the number of meetings in which that comment was made.

What the Data Sharing Partnership Should or Should NOT Be

- Availability of consistent, long-term funding for data development & maintenance, meeting local government accuracy needs (6)
- A central location where data can be sent by local govt. in existing formats to be reconfigured or translated to one consistent structure by the State (5)
- Shouldn't add work or cost for local governments (5)
- Development of a shared, statewide base of consistent, integrated, standardized data, regularly maintained (4)
- An agreement written in stone that assures provisions will be honored and outlines how data can be shared, but with an out-clause and periodic review (4)
- Must not reduce current funding or revenue streams associated with data, and must not damage existing programs (4)
- Benefits all parties, quid pro quo (4)
- Participation should not be mandated (4)
- Local processes should remain in local control (4)
- Partnership should not be an unfunded mandate (3)
- Should start with base data – well-defined, simple data sets developed in phases; this approach may help address some of the legal questions and could be an easier sell to the Legislature (3)
- Locals need to be protected from liability and risk associated with data sharing – look at emergency responders liability limitation statute as possible model (3)
- Intuitive interface/portal for public and others – centralized access (3)
- Involvement of cities and others, as well as counties (2)
- All stakeholders, especially local govt., must have adequate, equitable representation in administration of partnership (2)
- Education/training for users (2)
- Sharing should be mandated (2)
- Standards need to be developed for all shared data (2)
- Coordination of data development and use should be required, State to local & vice versa (1)
- Consistent minimum level of technology for all data producers (1)
- It should not be contingent on local governments using GIS (1)
- Different types of users with different needs taken into account: govt., public, business – should be tiers of sharing based on data users and uses (1)
- Simple, secure exchange mechanism (1)
- Not a single source of funding (1)

- Need to define products and deliverables from the partnership (1)
- Defined roles/responsibilities for each participant (1)
- About geospatial data, not everything else (1)
- Regional services, such as data integration or other tasks that locals & State can't do (1)
- Transfer of expertise between government agencies (1)
- Archived data made accessible (1)
- Expectations must be managed carefully – holes will exist for the time being where counties or cities don't want to participate (1)
- Minimal data requirements (1)
- State should develop data to fill holes where locals won't or can't participate initially, then turn over that data to local governments to maintain when they're ready, similar to Metro (1)

Barriers

- Current restrictions based on need for funding, to some extent – loss of revenue stream may occur (6)
- No inventory of needed data or existing data, technology or expenditures (5)
- Risk/liability issues, based on data usage (4)
- Roles/responsibilities, stewardship mechanism not clearly defined – who should do what? (3)
- Privacy/confidentiality issues, based on data usage – ex: owner's name (3)
- Update cycles for dynamic data are asynchronous and difficult to manage (2)
- Security concerns – ex: utility data, critical infrastructure (2)
- Different data and accuracy needs for locals vs. State agencies (2)
- Different logistical systems among locals – funding, formats, etc. (1)
- Loss of control – unintended consequences (1)
- Lack of trust (1)
- Staffing resources are insufficient and difficult to maintain for any length of time (1)
- State doesn't offer to share data now, not proactive about sharing data that may be useful (1)
- Metadata isn't sufficient for sharing – funding for metadata insufficient (1)
- Quality control processes aren't in place consistently, which creates more work for everyone because work done with low quality data has to be redone when better data is developed. (1)
- Initial development of data is perceived to have value and is often funded, but maintenance isn't widely recognized as having value and is often not funded. (1)
- Communication and coordination statewide is inadequate (1)
- There is no complete list of potential partners (1)
- Some won't want to participate (1)
- County departments don't always work well together and often don't know what data other departments in the same county have or need (1)
- Many rural counties, particularly east of the Cascades, don't have GIS staff and don't place a high priority on data maintenance (1)
- Data producers (local govts.) will see little of the money saved by data sharing (1)

Opportunities

- State can offer some things to local governments: (5)
 - DLCD Coastal Grant program can funnel federal dollars to local govts. for data devt.
 - ODF and ODOT have lots of imagery that could be exchanged with local governments for other data – this imagery would be valuable to local governments
 - Imagery could be acquired by the State for all partners on a regular cycle, thus allowing applications such as change detection.
 - ORMAP concept could serve as good model
 - Counties could receive certain data they couldn't otherwise afford, such as building footprints
 - HW/SW/tools for local govt., particularly if local govts. work together to aggregate data for a region
 - Centralized accessibility through portal or clearinghouse, providing data to citizens and private sector, taking burden off local governments
 - Create or help maintain metadata
- State could translate data or otherwise reformat it for data exchange purposes (4)
- Better coordination among partners will enable better services for the citizens. Partnership would help focus resources more effectively: (4)
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - Identifying underserved areas or at risk areas to improve public service provision.
 - Building permit data from DCBS e-permitting system could be shared with local govts.
 - Expertise and applications could be shared among all partners (geocoding, notifications).
- Involvement of all partners will result in more complete, higher quality data, thus better decisions (3)
- Private sector and federal funding potential (3)
- Web access = less support, based on experience of those doing it now (2)
- Local govts. could provide daily updates for dynamic data, while State could provide less timely updates of same data – daily updates could be sold as value-added product, State updates would be free (2)
- Private sector could be a partner: (1)
 - Insurance industry could use data to improve damage assessments; timber and real estate industries could also make good use of shared data
 - Title companies are starting to create their own information systems and analytical tools; they would benefit from more open data sharing and would be potential partners
- Increased efficiency in data development – elimination or reduction of duplicated effort (1)
- Economic development would benefit from better tracking of development decisions to determine if expected results were achieved (1)
- Deeds and property records could be captured electronically (1)
- Metro DRC is a good model, organizationally and operationally (1)

Concerns

There may not be sufficient incentives for data producers, some may not participate. Mandate to participate may be necessary, as in ORMAP, where the participants determine the best way to go, then they are mandated to follow that path if they want to receive incentives. In some areas, the incentives may be more difficult to identify because data sharing within the region is already happening. (3)

There may be liability or risk associated with data sharing, may need legislation for this. Users often use older data without realizing it, increasing risk. (2)

Local governments don't want outside sources telling them how or when to conduct their business. Local workload is often too much now, with too few resources, so this partnership can't place additional burdens on locals. (2)

Frequency of updates is a concern because there is little coordination between organizations with regard to maintenance of related data sets (2)

- The maintenance cycles of various data sets to be shared are not synchronized
- Users often don't recognize that they are using data that is updated at different times
- Would have to decide the update frequency of shared data sets

Data may be used in ways that are not agreed upon, misunderstood, or misapplied, particularly to enforce state or federal regulations. (2)

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. (2)

Privacy issues (1)

Revenue streams for data development and maintenance, existing or proposed, may go away. (1)

The proposed management structure for the partnership may not be effective, particularly if it becomes another layer of bureaucracy or administration. (1)

Local government data shared with State could disappear, never to be seen again (1)

Uncertainty about level of detail involved with shared data (1)

Not a common understanding of data sharing goals/objectives (1)

All government agencies don't share common values and philosophies (1)

- LCOG sells value-added products and services based on integration of data from cities and county
- Benton County and cities in Benton Co. make all data available free of charge

Sharing data between govt. agencies should be easier and less costly (1)

Formal vs. informal structure for working together – could use self-organizing approach (1)

More funding for tasks not associated with local business processes is not really what local governments want or need. (1)

There are usually strings attached to federal \$\$ that might be used to fund data development. (1)

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. (1)

The following questions need to be answered: (1)

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

Predicted cost of data and technology development must be estimated. Need inventory of data to be shared and technology needed. (5)

Finding the right incentives for each participant will be challenging. Those incentives may be different for each jurisdiction. Incentives must be articulated and demonstrated. Agency uses for shared data should be articulated as potential incentive for sharing. (4)

Process for collaborative problem resolution could be Legislative Work Group (3)

- Established by a Legislative Committee
- Local/state co-chairs
- No legislators, keep politics out of it
- Liaison from Work Group to Governor's Office and Legislature
- Could be established by Joint Legislative Committee on Information Mgmt. Tech.

Work Group may recommend more permanent partnership management structure

Should be driven initially by govt. agencies, private sector could be advisors

An inventory of existing data, technology, and past expenditures by local governments must be developed. (3)

Separating the partnership activities in to three steps or actions might make sense: (2)

- Administration – A number of comments were made that there is a need for a hub of coordination and communication that administers the partnership. Partners need a formal mechanism to commit to resolving issues.
- 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. Need an implementation plan to define data, participation, funding, and schedule.

Need to articulate how data could be shared in terms of possible mechanisms. (2)

Citizens should be part of the partnership organizational or management structure (2)

Better communication must start immediately. Other stakeholders must be brought in to discussion. AOC and LOC don't speak for all stakeholders. (1)

Partnership should be a phased approach (1)

Local government officials must be educated as to the rationale, benefits, and need for this partnership. (1)