

ORMAP Advisory Committee Meeting  
May 4, 2006  
Oregon Department of Revenue Salem Field Office

---

Advisory Committee Members: Brandt Melick, City of Springfield; Pat Shaw, Gilliam County; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Linc Cannon OFIC; Greg Baker, SOAO; Bob Harmon, OWRD; Dan Linscheid, Yamhill County; Brent Blair, BLM; Dick Inman, PGE

DOR Staff: Karen Gregory, DOR; Phil McClellan, DOR; Brett Juul, DOR; Elizabeth Harchenko, DOR; Mark Kinslow, DOR

Audience: Andrea Westersund, Multnomah County; Steve Ganoë, Marion County; Roger Livingston, Washington County; Hall Guttormsen, IDS Inc.; David Barbour, Tillamook County; Wendy Schink, Tillamook County; Jeri Sue Ponder, Clatsop County; Scott Valentine, Linn County; Keith Massie, Jackson County; Charles Adams, Douglas County; Wendell Lewis, Douglas County; Diana Bradrick, Washington County

**1. Introductions and Objective of the Meeting – Karen Gregory, DOR**

Karen gave an overview of the agenda items and objectives to be reviewed. She welcomed all attendees.

**2. ORMAP Coordinator Update – Phil, DOR**

**a. Goal 2 Update with ORMAP Website Demo**

Phil gave a presentation of the ORMAP Website. The major change is the addition of an address search tab in the maps on-line section. Users can now zoom directly to a street address, and view the Goal 2 data at the individual taxlot level. PDF files of the taxmaps will still be the product that can be downloaded. The enhancements will simply make it easier for users to search for the appropriate PDF file to download. We are also working to get the street labels added, again to assist users in locating where they are on the map.

Mark noted that this is our 2<sup>nd</sup> major deliverable (the first was the state-wide scanned PDFs), and that there was a lot of clean up and a huge amount of work on the part of our internal staff to develop the statewide layer. The Cadastral Data Exchange Standard group will be meeting next week to discuss ways to improve the data exchange standard to address some issues that were identified in the process of combining all 36 county datasets.

The statewide shape file is made up of 1.7 million polygons and includes data from all 36 counties, and is a direct result of the work of ORMAP.

Addresses aren't provided as part of the ORMAP Goal 2 deliverables for every county, so ORMAP will be using geocoded road centerline files for searching by address. Street names will be included on the display.

Users can still search by tax lot number, township and range. The "address" tab option is for those who know the street address. This will give them the ability to find their map. A disclaimer says that information is updated quarterly. Assessor's maps have the date on them.

Brandt: This is a huge effort. It's nice to see it all come together like this.

Phil: Hopefully we will have it available on the web soon. There are still a few issues to resolve so that the site can handle data requests from so many users at once.

**b. Fund Update (Handout)**

Phil reported on the quarter ending March 31, 2006. The report included what has been spent in each county. The 2<sup>nd</sup> page gave deposits and break downs.

Linc suggested a total of reversions be listed, but on the whole, this table is very helpful.

The quarterly fund deposit is approximately \$300,000. A total of \$89,249 is remaining in the fund after funding the spring 2006 grants. The counties have asked for a total of \$582,011.00 this time. Phil reviewed a table that gave the outstanding balances of each county. All funds are earmarked for use by each county that have outstanding balances.

Karen: Most of the funding clean up was taken care of when Phil first came on board. Phil tries to make sure that nothing expires without first notifying the county.

**c. Partnerships**

Several avenues have been explored but there is a problem getting commitments from organizations. The committee needs to define more specifically what a partnership is.

**d. Status of Data Use Agreements with DOR**

Phil: We have informal agreements from all the counties. These informal agreements were put in place since the statewide DAS agreement project was not moving fast enough to let DOR move forward with goal 2 work. We will continue to work with DAS on the more formal statewide agreements in the coming months. DAS agreements that were signed are still in force.

Mark: The DAS agreement will be a real challenge. Without some level of consistency it is becoming very difficult to administer data sharing. There is still an issue of sharing beyond state agencies.

Dean: A website data base with a simple query could be supported very easily that would show what is available from each county. Dean will work with Cy Smith to see that agreements are accessible to state agencies and others.

Mark: We want to be responsible for a single data layer, not all 36 counties' datasets.

Brandt: Could the existing agreements be linked to the website so that other agencies and counties could see them?

Dean: This would be an issue for OGIC. He will discuss with Cy Smith.

### **3. Funding Criteria – Phil, Mark, DOR (Handout)**

#### **a. Review how criteria were used for the spring 2006 funding cycle.**

Numbers 1-4 rated a pass or fail. Mark asked if these criteria could be used as a spring grant proposal test.

No objections were voiced.

#### **b. Finalize Criteria to be used in future fund cycles**

- Project type:
  - a-c: acceptable
  - d: Counties that are close to finishing.

Brandt: If there is a grant that will help them make the deadline that could be a way of measuring.

Mark: That would bring in more projects and we could make that another criterion (it would water down this particular one).

Brandt: Our objective is to help counties get to goal 4.

Linc: It would reward those who are doing a good job. In the next grant cycle they are not as inclined to ask for funding.

Mark: We will make that change to these criteria.

- Technical priority: all were acceptable in this category
- Policy Priority:
  - a. Acceptable as is.
  - b. Grants demonstrating funding partnerships: The Tech group will decide how heavily this will be weighted and determine a point value with the understanding that this criteria is above and beyond what the tech group defines it as.

c. Acceptable as is.

Mark: If you have questions please contact Phil. We will use these criteria in the coming cycle. If more items are added, we will bring them to your attention.

Linc: If a partnership exists that is contributing new money, this should be weighted more heavily than people donating their time.

The committee agreed to use this for the next cycle with the option to make changes as needed in succeeding cycles.

#### **4. Issues identified by the ORMMap Tech Group**

##### **A. Deliverable - Elizabeth**

Mark: There continues to be some confusion related to the Goal 4 deliverable. Unless a decision is made to the contrary, it needs to be clearly stated that we expect Goal 4 data to include only the taxlot line work, taxlot number and map number. It has become clear that there is not a consensus on what constitutes goal 4 data and what sharing issues we are facing.

Phil and Brett gave an update on what goal 4 data is and what we hope to accomplish by Oct 2008.

Brett: We see this as not only all the polygons and shape files; all the other layers, annotation, supplemental line work, assessors' hard copy map, etc. We have worked to define how to store all this information and produce a standard map; to maintain it in a standard manner and have a community of people that have the same knowledge.

Mark: All we are doing now is sharing the data for viewing and searching. The Real Property table is optional. It won't be included in the goal 4 deliverable.

Elizabeth: Are there counties who won't be able to accomplish that or have a problem with the nature of the information?

Phil: Some counties are concerned that once the information is to goal 4, it will be made available. There is confusion as to what goal 4 is to be.

Elizabeth: The original vision was recognizing GIS as a technology that could be used for many different purposes; to connect to information that could be used for emergency management, watershed information, air quality, roads planning, animal migration etc; anything that needs to have information that is as accurate as possible. Our part was to create a seamless statewide taxlot map that could be used by entities that are tied to land and could use ORMMap in their work. There are issues of privacy (name, address, and contact information), commercial value of collection of data, interests on the part of counties and legislature recouping their investment in this venture. Assessor's need to

do their work but ORMAP needs to be useable in other ways. Being available on a web site makes people nervous of public accessibility. This group does not have the responsibility to decide the issues of sharing information. Part of the vision is the capacity of the public tool we create that others can use. The high level information from DAS was that technology could or would soon be able to allow data sets to be managed from a central location and distributed in a secure environment. Public records laws will have to be updated to be able to deal with new technology. Our original goals were intended to be visionary because we didn't know the details. The tech group was created to deal with the specifics. As we move toward a digital image, issues will come up that will need to be addressed by that group.

**e. ORMAP – A case for Mapping Exceptions - Dean Anderson (Handout)**

The Problem: The Goal 4 mapping standards cannot be met in some urban areas. There are some urban areas where it will be very tough or impossible to map. Dean gave three examples as shown on the handout, one being Falls City. For 20 years surveyors have mistakenly used a witness corner as a DLC corner. To fix the problem, the community would have to be resurveyed. Falls City has declined this proposal. The two other examples are downtown Dallas and Buena Vista. We would like to reserve the right, that if it is not contentious, the errors be put in the street. Dean recommended that exception areas be documented, and justification be provided for areas that need to be removed from goal 4 standards. If these issues have to be dealt with some day, the courts would be the ultimate deciding factor. Dean would rather not communicate these issues to the public but have the survey problems documented for the ORMAP program.

Karen asked if it would be helpful to work on criteria to have for exception areas. The group was in agreement.

***Future agenda item: Karen asked the tech group to bring their ideas to discuss at the next meeting.***

**f. October 2008 Completion Deadline – Keith Massie**

Even with additional funding, it will not be possible for a number of counties to meet ORMAP Goal 4 by October 2008 deadline. Keith proposed that the date be moved to 2012. Even if the date stays at 2008 we will have to move at the same pace. It was a good goal when we set it but it has become unrealistic. We would be able to produce a better product when we aren't being rushed. With an extended deadline there would be less likelihood of draining the fund. We are also waiting on the ESRI parcel data model and productivity model that will help us produce maps more quickly.

A good goal 5: Creating data that supports the assessment process such as tax code boundaries, school boundaries, city limit boundaries. The public is going to want better information than what the state can provide. A good goal 5 would be to provide funding for good internet applications for people to use. ORMAP should consider funding public access to this information. The public cares about the ease of use and getting the information that they need. It saves a trip to each county to get the needed information.

Mark said that there are three options to decide on about the Goal 4 deadline:

1. Do nothing
2. Adjust the deadline
3. Adjust the definition of goal 4

Discussion:

- Keith said that redefining goal 4 is not a good idea. We are already 3-4 years into the process.
- Mark: Dean's proposal of exception areas would redefine goal 4 to some extent. The exception areas might help us get closer to the percentage of goal 4 data.
- Brett: Staff turnover for counties and DOR also affects the goal deadline. It takes six months to a year and sometimes two to three years depending on the level of technical training an employee needs to produce maps that meet Goal 4 standards.
- Greg Baker: What will we produce with these millions of dollars? What will we deliver to the public?
- Keith: What the public cares about is getting to the information, accessing it and using it for their purposes. Public access is much more important than spatial accuracy.
- Karen: There are a number of options. We can work with the tech group and see if there are options to these dates. Rather than having 90% to goal 4, we could change the percentage to 70%. This may not be the solution but the issue is something that we should work on.
- Linc: Don't reorder goal 4 but instead, recategorize. Percentages by certain years including the exception piece would be good. There is no point in having goals that don't reflect reality.
- Karen: Resolving the data use agreement issues is very important.
- Brandt: We need some interpretation of building fund maintenance. People do not have money and it will not get better. We can work out these issues in terms of goals and sustainability and future development.
- Mark: Would it be helpful to have the tech group define what constitutes maintenance?
- Brandt: Should there be some incentives to move toward a single system and what would be the makeup of those incentives?
- Dean: Maintenance should not be a part of getting to goal 4.

- Andrea: We have to make a polygon map for ORMAP when something gets moved. This eats into our regular work time. Who pays for it?
- Mark: The statute says that our goal is the development of a statewide base layer.
- Greg: For assessment and tax purposes you will only need so much.
- Brandt: Could we keep the goal 4 date since many will meet that goal and then set another date?

Mark: To summarize, it sounds like the committee is agreeable to having realistic percentages applied to the date. The amount that is completed will be different but the date will stay.

- Steve Gano: The emphasis is too heavy on the accuracy portion. The main emphasis should be on getting it out there.
- Linc: Accuracy has always been the highest priority. The exception idea is excellent.
- Pat Shaw: How do we get a statewide map without accuracy?
- Brett: If you want a statewide map you have to have accuracy. You have to remember to edge match and it hasn't always been done.
- Pat: It is more important to have exceptions and lengthening out the deadlines instead of sacrificing accuracy.
- Linc: The goal is correct. We can adjust the target.
- Dan Linscheid: We could have a joint meeting on what our goals should be (accuracy important) if it becomes a stumbling block.
- Brandt: The needs for accuracy are important. What are good points in time when some of this can be delivered?
- Robert Harmon: Although accuracy is important, access should not wait until the very end.
- Mark: Does the advisory group want DOR staff to come up with thoughts or ideas on defining goal 4 with which the group can establish a priority?
- Dick Inman: Advisory committee could also come up with ideas.
- Mark: These ideas can then be submitted to the tech group and we can devise a strategic plan for the future.

## 5. Process for defining Goal 5 and beyond.

As the 2008 date approaches, many counties will have completed ORMAP Goal 4 deliverable. Unless a decision is made to the contrary, it needs to be clearly stated that we expect Goal 4 data to include only the taxlot line work, taxlot number and map number.

Mark: What is a process that we would like to use to define a goal 5 and beyond?

What would be helpful for you to define what comes next?

Discussion:

- Keith: We need improved quality of data, and improved access. The tech committee could take that big picture and come back with a specific goal.
- Mark: Is the understanding that it would be best to finish up goal 4 before moving into goal 5?

- Mark: Does the advisory group want DOR staff to come up with thoughts or ideas on defining goal 4 with which the group can establish a priority?
- Dick Inman: Advisory committee could also come up with ideas.
- Mark: These ideas can then be submitted to the tech group and we can devise a strategic plan for the future.

**6. Topics for the Fall 2006 Meeting – October 5, 2006**

- ♦ Special meeting to deal with goal 5?
- ♦ Second run through of the funding criteria for the grant process in the fall
- ♦ Policy papers on exceptions and goal 4 completion dates & maintenance
- ♦ Work with the technical group on recommendations.
- ♦ DOR will put together some recommendations for following goals after goal 4.
- ♦ Possibility for developing a strategic plan for ORMAP.
- ♦ Strategic direction: Brandt proposed that other members bring forward the diverse needs of the group and how ORMAP might serve those needs.

Adjourned 1:13 PM