

## **Meeting Notes**

**from the**

### **Data Sharing Partnership Meeting**

**Conducted at the Tillamook 911 Center**

**October 25, 2006**

This was the second 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***

- Benefits all parties
- Simple exchange mechanism
- Secure data exchange
- Review of partnership periodically
- Standardized data sets, maintained regularly
- Clearly outline how data can be shared
- Funding in place to sustain data maintenance
- Education/training for users
- Intuitive interface/portal for public
- No additional costs for local governments for formatting, etc.
- Not a single source of funding – diversify
- Participation should not be mandated
- Local processes should remain in local control

#### ***Barriers***

- No formal identification or authorization for data stewardship activities, such as integration
- Some cities and counties don't have resources to participate digitally
- 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.
- 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.
- No identification of needed data; no inventory of existing data
- Confidentiality and privacy issues

## ***Opportunities***

- DLCD Coastal Grant program can funnel federal dollars to local govts. for data development
- State could translate data or otherwise reformat it for data exchange purposes
- Identifying underserved areas or at risk areas to improve public service provision
- Private sector could be a partner – insurance industry could use data to improve damage assessments; timber and real estate industries could also make good use of shared data
- High quality information = better decisions and improved services
- Economic development would benefit from better tracking of development decisions to determine if expected results were achieved
- 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
- 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

## ***Concerns***

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

- 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

Some won't participate, regardless of solution, program, or incentives

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

Partners need a formal mechanism to commit to resolving issues.

Conduct inventory of existing Framework data sets.

Develop list of data to be shared.

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

## ***Participants in Tillamook Meeting***

Jeri Sue Ponder, Clatsop County GIS Manager

Eileen Ystad, Clatsop County GIS

Wendy Schink, Tillamook County

Tim Lutz, Tillamook County Assessor

Gary Gipson, Oregon Employment Dept.

Mark Labhart, Tillamook County Commissioner

Craig Schwink, Tillamook County

Bill Campbell, Tillamook County Planning/Development Manager

David Barbour, Tillamook County GIS Manager

David Mattison, City of Tillamook

Cy Smith, Dept. of Administrative Services