

## **Meeting Notes**

from the

### **Data Sharing Partnership Meeting Conducted at the Metro Data Resource Center November 1, 2006**

This was the sixth 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***

- Quid pro quo – equal value from both sides
- Integrated local data that locals still find useful – this is the State's role
- Sustainable funding
- Phased approach – fewer data themes to start
- Minimal data requirements
- State law could limit local exposure to risk and liability – emergency responders law in this regard might be a model
- Should not be an unfunded mandate
- Should not result in loss or damage to existing successful programs, like Metro
- Should be a formal agreement of some kind that commits the partners to participate
- Consistent, statewide data; this means no holes, the State would develop data to fill in holes and turn that data over to the local govts. when they're ready (Metro model)

#### ***Barriers***

- Coordination with cities and others isn't happening right now
- Different data needs for locals vs. State agencies
- Integration of local data between jurisdictions isn't a local mission
- Security concerns
- Current restrictions based on need for funding, to some extent
- Risk/liability issues, based on data usage
- Update cycles for dynamic data are asynchronous and difficult to manage
- Privacy/confidentiality issues, based on data usage

#### ***Opportunities***

- Metro is a good model on all sorts of levels, including organization and operations
- Certain aspects of ORMAP could be a good model, conceptually
- Web-based data access could be developed and enhanced for everyone

- Counties could get certain data they couldn't otherwise afford, such as building footprints and permit info from the state e-permitting system
- Increased funding for locals
- HW/SW/Infrastructure to be used by local governments that don't have it & can't afford it
- Revenue sharing between state and local governments could happen, where state acquires local data, integrates it ala the Metro model and sell the value-added product, then shares the revenue with local governments around the state to augment maintenance and improvements

### ***Concerns***

Sharing data between government agencies should be easier and less costly

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

Formal vs. informal structure for working together – could use the self-organizing approach

Demonstrating/articulating incentives for participation in a statewide data sharing initiative will be more difficult in the Metro area because they are already doing it for their region; what are the incentives over and above what they already accrue?

### ***Actions or Ideas for Next Steps***

Demonstrate incentives

Involve citizens – this may be where we can intensify a sense of urgency about data sharing

Demonstrate how State would enable data sharing – how this would work operationally

Agreed on needed data

Legislative Working Group seems like the right process approach for working together to resolve issues collaboratively in the beginning. Could be established by JLCIMT.

### ***Participants in Portland Meeting***

Nancy Tubbs, USGS

Susan Blohm, City of Salem

Gail Ewart, Dept of Administrative Services

Mark Darienzo, OR DLCD

Lynne Sleight, Clackamas County

Jimmy Kagan, OSU Inst. for Natural Resources

Lance Murty, Multnomah County

John Riles, Multnomah County

Andrea Westersund, Multnomah County

Kathy Tuneberg, Multnomah County

June Tilgner, Multnomah County

Randy Walruff, Multnomah County

Rob McDougald, ESRI

Molly Vogt, City of Gresham

Jeff Comstock, Port of Portland

Stan Frazier, BLM

Gary Hubbard, Washington Co. A&T

Diana Bradrick, Washington Co. A&T

Jon Greninger, Washington Co. A&T

Roger Livingston, Washington Co. A&T

Nels Mickaelson, Washington Co. A&T

Ken Sigismund, Washington Co. CIO

Carol Hall, Metro DRC

Elizabeth Ohlmann, Multnomah Co.

Dick Bolen, Metro RDC

Kevin Babbitt, Washington Co. ITS

Jim Austin, Clackamas County

Cy Smith, Dept. of Administrative Services