

## Data Sharing Partnership Task Force Meeting Notes – February 15

### Pre-Meeting Comments (via e-mail)

#### Bob Swank

Issues to consider for next round of the Road Show on the Action Plan

- What value do local govts. find in integrated data (e.g. Metro)?

I doubt that many local government staff understand or know about integrated data, let alone the value that it provides. And there are many that believe the only good data is their own data. There are many general statements of the value of integrated data:

1. Much more comprehensive information can be made available. Such as taxlots for cities and city zoning for the county.
2. Multiage or regional functions such as emergency dispatch can work with consistent information covering multiple governments.
3. Integration reduces duplications, errors and inconsistencies. Data should be captured just once, at the point that it is created and then shared appropriately. The creation of a site address file for Lane County eliminated many inconsistent files and formats. It was heavily used by A&T, Elections and Public Safety. Even Public Works used it to improve road signs and road name consistency. The City of Springfield was maintaining three different address collections that were inconsistent.
4. Integration is also much more efficient. Lane County A&T now receives digital subdivisions plats from cities that can be incorporated into tax maps without being recreated.
5. Political and policy level issues also benefit from consistent data that is commonly used and accepted.

- What data/services do the local govts. need now/soon/someday?

Local governments benefit from guidelines and standards for required data. ORMAP is a success in many ways, but one of the biggest benefits to Lane County was the standards eliminated all the arguments about what data is required and how it should be configured. There are also many data types that local governments do not typically create, such as flood plans, soil types and contours that are useful, especially if registered correctly. This is not new news because these are all included in different framework layers.

- How do we address the needs of the data resource-poor jurisdictions?

There are two relevant answers to this question. First, those that want to use the data from data resource-poor jurisdictions should determine a way to help create and access the data. Second, jurisdiction that are data resource poor usually place a lower priority on data, often because they are smaller and more familiar with the area than is possible in a large jurisdiction. In Lane County the smaller cities pay nothing to marginal costs compared to the major participants so complete county wide data is available. The smaller cities data is usually less complete and timely, and less frequently used.

- How can we best support the mandates of locals, state, tribes, etc.?

Financial support.

- How can the State make its data more accessible to local governments?

By making it available in the formats and scales that are useful. An interesting opportunity is growing with respect to building permits. I am not very knowledgeable about this, but I understand that the State is providing some permits tracking for commercial and industrial construction. This should be a very useful source of land use data for local governments, so someone needs to make data that is useful to local governments is captured and made available in an appropriate way.

What should we present in the Action Plan Road Show?

The Road Show needs a convincing presentation about the value of data integration and sharing. It also needs to address the outstanding issues about respecting data ownership and not compromising local issues or revenue streams. It might also be useful to include some long term direction from the most recent publication of the National Research Council. I have only read the Executive Summary, but there is reality that if the Federal government is ultimately going to require data partnerships Oregon would be way ahead to define the best way to do it.

### Dean Anderson

1. We need an organizational structure for managing/addressing data sharing issues.

2. The group should have a draft charter. I think this group will only be able to a) identify issues, c) develop plans for addressing them, and c) present potential solutions to OGIC, state agencies, AOC, GPL, the league of Oregon Cities and others. However, this group should be officially recognized in some way (the easiest is to have it initially be a standing OGIC committee) to do the previously mentioned functions.

3. We need a facilitator/leader of this data sharing group that is from a data producing organization. Such as a county, city, water resources, ODOT, etc. Obviously, my bias is that we have a local government person do this (not me).

3. This group needs to identify priorities for data sharing, based on these priorities the group should develop mechanisms (ie: subcommittees, special interest groups, sub-taskforces to address these issues. These issues could be what tools can be used to assist data sharing, what policies will assist or detract from data sharing, business models for data sharing etc...

4. Finally, we should not focus on a) long term business models for sharing/funding, b) hold statewide meetings, c) nor promote data sharing tools (such as navigator) until we have our management framework in place and until these issues have been priorities by the group.

I think it is really important to do this because...

1. We need to start some where.

2. Discussions about future business plans and data sharing tools will only detract/confuse us and the potential data sharing community from developing an initial plan and structure for working together.

3. We need to get going!!!! We have been discussing this issue and a plan for over a year and not much has been accomplished. That is not to say that there have not been data sharing accomplishments in the past year. However, I thought our task force goal is to develop a framework to address data sharing issues and promote/facilitate the sharing of geographic information in the State of Oregon.

## Meeting Discussion

*Attempt to provide teleconference capability failed due to technical difficulties until 20 minutes after the meeting was started.*

- There may be an impact on the revenue stream from data sales for local governments if data sharing becomes widespread.
- There is still a question as to what the State can provide in terms of a data sharing partnership. The list might include:
  - Census geography at a fine resolution – block group or better
  - Detours on highways
  - LIDAR and processing
  - CORS control data and corrections data
  - Re-projection of State data sets to State Plane coordinate system
- The 2005 aerial imagery and processing were very useful, but when is the next series scheduled? The answer to that needs to be communicated and a consortium needs to be built to make it happen.
- We should identify which agencies have what data at the State level.
- The Task Force may also need to survey the local jurisdictions to find out what data is needed, but if the list of available State data can be provided, local governments can gain an understanding of what value the State brings to the partnership.
- What are the priorities for the data sharing partnership?
- What's in it for the local governments?
- If we identify what data the State can make available, and what data the locals need, we can identify the gaps and take action to fill them.
- Official requests from the State for local government data would have an impact. Those requests should make it clear why the data is important and show how it will be used. The State needs to be specific about what will be done with the data, then we need to follow through, deliver on what we say will be done and the proposed results.
- Many local governments have web portals to provide access to their departments and citizens. There may not be a need for a statewide web portal to provide access to data for local governments and the public.
  - One reason for such a portal would be to provide access to data between jurisdictions in a comprehensive, consistent manner. If a jurisdiction (or agency or person) has access to data in one county or city from the local web portal, they may often also need access to data from the jurisdiction next door,

or access to regional data from multiple nearby jurisdictions for things like public safety or natural resource mgmt. If the neighboring jurisdictions have web portals for their data, it may not be very easy for the user to combine the data in to a comprehensive view to meet their business needs. A statewide portal would play that role.

- Even though a statewide portal could be a valuable tool, the timing for pursuing it may not be good based on the economy.
- A bad economic climate makes resources scarce, but that scarcity often causes people and agencies to look for ways to work together more efficiently.
- The statewide web portal is part of the navigatOR concept, which has been proposed as a big ticket item in the past. It was pointed out that a big portion of the navigatOR expense is to complete the Framework data sets, and that a large part of the data development money would go to local governments to build data they need in a standardized manner.

#### Next Steps

- Governance for the Data Sharing Partnership needs to be more formalized in terms of membership and relationship to other groups, such as OGIC, AOC, LOC, etc.
- Dept. of Revenue and Dept. of Transportation will develop more detailed action plans in response to the high level actions with which they were tasked in the latest Local/State Data Sharing Partnership – Proposed Action Plan posted at: <http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/datasharing/DataSharingActionPlan2007.ppt>
- Action Plan additions should be made, including:
  - Data sharing protocols – lessons learned from the m49 data sharing effort
  - Need to move forward on liability issue, either with the State purchasing more liability insurance to cover local governments for data sharing or new legislation
- Report to OGIC on progress/status
- Collect metrics on current data sharing