

**Meeting Notes**  
from the  
**Data Sharing Partnership Meeting**  
Conducted at the Lane Council of Governments Office  
October 31, 2006

This was the fifth 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***

- Successful for all – benefits for all (ORMAP model)
- Quid pro quo
- Standards developed for shared data
- Funding to meet standards
- Voluntary
- Central source for disaster recovery, etc.
- Regional services, such as data integration or other tasks that locals & State can't do
- Funded properly – could eliminate need to sell data
- State transforms local data to meet standards
- Transfer of expertise between government agencies
- Archived data made accessible
- Start small, but build to all public records of common interest
- Should not create more work for local govts.
- Should not lose existing successful approaches and programs
- Should not dictate business models to local govts.

***Barriers***

- No inventory of needed data
- Loss of revenue stream from data sales
- Privacy issues – ex: owner's name
- Security issues – ex: utility data
- Confidentiality issues – ex: public safety officials
- Potential for misuse of data
- Different logistical systems among locals – funding, formats, etc.
- Roles/responsibilities not clearly defined – who should do what?

***Opportunities***

- Additional funding from partners (feds, private sector)

- State could take burden of providing data to public, feds, others
- State could transform/translate data to common format/structure
- Property change detection with imagery
- Could capture deeds/property records electronically
- State could create metadata and/or help maintain it

### ***Concerns***

Current local government workload is often too much now, with too few resources, so this partnership can't place additional burdens on locals

There's not a common understanding of data sharing goals/objectives

All government agencies don't share common values and philosophies

- 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

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

Articulate and demonstrate incentives for local govts. to participate

Need inventory of needed data

Legislative Work Group could be good approach for resolving issues collaboratively

### ***Participants in Eugene Meeting***

Ollie Snowden, Lane Co. Public Works  
 Chris Shirley, OR DLCD  
 Jim Gangle, Lane County Assessor  
 Sheila Lyons, ODOT  
 Pete Brandstetter, City of Albany  
 Bob DenOuden, LCOG  
 Jon Jablonski, UofO Library

Alice Grucea, City of Corvallis  
 Eric Brandt, LCOG  
 John Caputo, Yamhill County  
 Bob Swank, LCOG  
 Grace McDonald, Marion County  
 Cress Bates, Lane Co. Public Works  
 Cy Smith, Dept. of Administrative Services