

1

ORMAP Advisory Committee Meeting**June 28, 2001****10:00 AM to 3:30 PM****South Salem Field Office**

Members Attending: Elizabeth Harchenko (facilitator), Marc Thomas, Anna Morrison, Mark Kinslow, Dick Inman, Jerry Hanson, and Linc Cannon.

Absent Members: Greg Baker, Steve West, Harvey Nelson, and Mike Propes.

Others Attending: Nancy Holmes, Jim Manary, TC Curlee, Gerald Longton, Kerry Savage, Tycho Granville, Scott Hartell, Eric Gillett, Brett Juul, Matthew Krusemark, Andrea Westersund, Bob Haas, Dan Malaer, Scott Jackson, Dan Linscheid, and Cy Smith.

Agenda Item: *Contract Status Update*

Jim Manary gave an update on Goal 1 funds. Agreements have been sent to the county assessors and funds have been distributed for the signed agreements received. Department of Revenue is working on preparing some advice for how the counties should manage the funds in anticipation of audits from the Secretary of State's office. Contracts for Goals 2 through 4 proposals have been sent to the counties for review and the Attorney General's office has already approved use of the contract. The proposal will be attached to and made a part of the contract.

Agenda Item: *Regional Proposal Update*

Jim Manary reviewed the flow chart that explains the proposal review process. The technical committee reviews each proposal before the advisory committee recommends funding. Not all regions were ready to submit proposals. The

regional funds remaining after this first round of funding will continue to accumulate in the regional accounts for those counties not requesting regional funds. The proposals consist of a variety of projects.

Marc Thomas gave an update on the National Modernization of Land and Realty Information Initiative in Congress. Letters have been written to various legislators asking for support/backing to fund the project. There is a request for money to be given to BLM that would be earmarked for projects like ORMAP and would support GIS. \$15 million would develop plans like ORMAP in other states. Oregon would get about \$1 million out of the plan.

Agenda Item: *Discretionary proposals*

2

At the last meeting the Advisory Committee discussed the proposal specifications (discretionary fund request), what goals the proposals would achieve, ORMAP standards, and policy considerations.

The applications were received and distributed to the technical group. The technical group reviewed the proposals for deliverables, timeframe, cost, maintenance plans, tie to goal(s), partnerships, ORMAP standards, and equipment pieces.

The Advisory Committee agreed that an ORMAP from the Tech Group on each proposal would be helpful. After reviewing all proposals, the committee will make motion and vote on recommending the Dept. of Revenue fund the proposal.

Scott Jackson gave a brief ORMAP of the categories in which the proposals were arranged. Pre-conversion is work to be done before the maps are converted from paper to ensure higher quality control. Conversion, paper to digital is converting the paper maps to digital images that are tied to the ground.

Financial partners for the project are listed. Digital Upgrade proposals are post digital conversion projects usually to improve control in urban growth areas. The tech group reviewed each proposal to verify that the proposal meets ORMAP standards and if there was a more advantageous alternative to the project. The tech group is not saying that they recommend funding the proposals, just that the proposal meets technical requirements and could be completed as proposed.

Advisory Committee would like to know if the proposals will meet the goals.

Next, the proposals were reviewed.

Clatsop: Department of Revenue conversion project. The proposal will provide for ortho photography that will tie down more accurately and define islands and waterways. The county is matching funds of the contract for ortho photos.

Tillamook: Department of Revenue has an agreement with the county but are not able to continue working due to the lack of control points available. Project will fund survey staff to get control points. The alternative project would be completed in less time but at an additional \$20,000 for equipment upgrade cost.

Coos: Going to acquire an outside vendor for map conversion. This will cover all tax lots in the county.

Hood River: Department of Revenue has an agreement to maintain the counties maps and are in the process of converting from paper to digital. This project would complete their conversion by funding Department of Revenue. Maps are not currently tied to the ground; Department of Revenue is using existing BLM data along with new county surveyor data.

Sherman: Sherman is a maintenance county and they are seeking to convert to digital by using a vendor. The rural areas would meet Goal 3 and 4.

Crook: Project will fund student interns to convert 60-75% of the county maps. The new digital map will meet Goal 2 in the urban areas and Goal 3 and or 4 in the rural areas.

Baker: Department of Revenue maintains and did a conversion a few years ago. Baker County wants to convert Department of Revenue files into a useable GIS format and Department of Revenue would continue to maintain maps. Hoping that additional funding would come from partners for future projects with results from this project. The county has revised the proposal from the original to meet ORMAP guidelines. The county is mostly rural. Baker receives a paper copy of the updated maps from Department of Revenue. ESRI product is the proposed software. The quote for the proposed server came from the county IT consultant. The project will not die if the equipment is not funded. They would continue the conversion. The technology is not available for an Internet based application that the county would use to access digital maps. GIS is dependent upon cadastral mapping. How does this relate to ORMAP? ESRI as a vendor would not recommend purchasing the server. They would recommend purchasing the hardware. The "needs assessment" is probably outside the scope of ORMAP. Concerns were expressed regarding the Baker county proposal to purchase a server.

What are the side boundaries that the legislature has created in funding? We can go back to the legislature to possibly broaden the funding spectrum.

Deschutes: Bob feels Deschutes is more appropriately categorized as an upgrade to digital. It converts 160 maps to digital. They have a team of 2 temporary employees who are working on this now. Depending on the progress, they plan to use the employees on projects to reach Goal 4 status. The county

has approximately 1600 maps.

Gilliam: Working with surveyor to get better control in the city of Condon to reach Goal 4. The county surveyor will do the work.

Wallowa: Involved in a pilot project with a vendor. Looking for additional funds to get better control and reach Goal 4. Pilot has been completed.

Union: Software upgrade is arc view 8.1 from arc view 2.1. Looking at entering into a contract w/ Department of Revenue to convert maps. Partners were not listed in the summary.

Wasco: Financial partners are cash contributions. The county has a policy decision not to share data because they do not have enough funding for the GIS without financial partners who essentially are buying rights to the data. The county is unable to share data with anyone other than those financial partners, therefore required to sell data to non-financial partners. Wasco County is at Goal 4

4 and a maintenance county of Department of Revenue. Other counties within the region are too far behind to match borders. The database is customized to the financial partners listed in the proposal. Parcel matches with bordering counties is a long-term goal. Under the cost sharing of maintaining their maps, Department of Revenue has access to the maps.

Issue of Paying for Data

Who owns the data under the ORMAP project? Cy's interpretation of the law is that anyone will be able to download each map but if they wanted to get the data on CD's then the charge would include hiring a temporary employee to create the CD's. The fee could be requested in advance of doing the work. Basic information will be accessible from the Internet. Providing information and a

service are two issues blended together.

Issue is paying for the county to make adjustments to meet ORMAP standards and then the data rights issue comes up every year. There is uncertainty and hesitation with the counties in releasing data that they are currently charging for. Eventually, private sector companies may end up releasing data and charging for it. Currently, some counties have license agreements that prevent private sector companies from reproducing and selling the data. Counties may request funds for maintenance issues on an annual basis and will this prevent them from getting funds for maintenance purposes.

Polk: Proposal is for staff time for surveyor and cartographer.

Yamhill: County had to layoff 2 employees in March due to lack of funds. This proposal would allow them to rehire one of the employees to get the project rolling.

Jackson: Proposal would fund surveyor for additional control points, county cartographers and DOR for map development in problem areas.

Lincoln: To fund county surveyor to get control points and hire temporary cartographer to develop new maps.

Linn: This is a pilot project that is high on the innovation side. Explores how incentives could bring the private surveying sector into developing additional control data for GIS. The county would pay private surveyors \$300 with each filing if the surveyor had referenced the survey to at least two control reference points.

R-Map: The region includes Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties. This proposal would allow the region to be tied together along the common boundaries of Multnomah County. This would happen in about 3 years but with

ORMAP funding but can be completed in three months with the funding.

5

VOTING: Advisory Committee agrees voting will be done by consensus. If the proposal is not recommended for funding, the Department of Revenue still has the option to fund the proposal or the county could resubmit for the next round of funding.

Clatsop: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Tillamook: Alternative One: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Coos: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Hood River: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Sherman: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Crook: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Baker: Kerry Savage would like to modify the proposal. Baker County would drop the server, #1 would remain, keep plotter, bump up PC to \$2000, the new proposal drops to \$41,000, \$30,000 to convert and \$11,000 for equipment to proof the work. Equipment would total \$11,000 and the "needs assessment" would be dropped. Revision: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund modified proposal.

Deschutes: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Gilliam: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Wallowa: Marc Thomas abstains due to conflict of interest. Advisory Committee (w/o Marc) recommends DOR fund proposal.

Union: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Wasco: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund Wasco County no more

than \$5850 with a revised proposal that fits within the ORMAP standards after Tech Group review.

Polk: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Yamhill: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Jackson: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Lincoln: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

6

Linn: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

R-Map: Advisory Committee recommends DOR fund proposal.

Agenda Item: *Next meeting*

Local budgets operate on a fiscal year from July through June. Meeting in January would fit nicely for the counties to plan ahead for funding these projects.

Advisory Committee agrees to meet in January.

Comments/Feedback: Department of Revenue will continue to work with Cy and the AG's office to resolve some of the issues regarding data ownership.

Conversation in January should include issues for the next legislative session.

Discussion of an orderly way of continuing membership of the committee will also be discussed.