

ORMAP Advisory Committee Meeting
Department of Revenue Salem Field Office
October 5, 2006 10AM

Committee Members: Pat Shaw, Dick Inman, Mike Livingston, Mike Daly, Brent Blair, Mark Labhart, Bob Harmon, Dan Linscheid, Brandt Melick

DOR Attendees: Karen Gregory, Brett Juul, Mark Kinslow, Phil McClellan

Gallery: Dean Anderson (Polk County), Bob Haas (Deschutes County), Eric Bohard (Clackamas County), Steve Ganoë (Marion County), Roger Livingston (Washington County), John Shaw, David Barbour (Tillamook County)

1. Introduction and Objectives – Karen Gregory
ORMAP pioneers Dick Inman and Gregg Baker will be leaving the committee along with Anna Morrison. Dick and Gregg were here from the inception of ORMAP. Karen thanked them for their vision, hard work and dedication to the project. She welcomed new members, Mark Labhart of Tillamook County, Mike Livingston of PGE, Mike Daly of Deschutes County and Larry Hatch of WCCCA to the many challenges that still lie ahead for ORMAP.
2. ORMAP Coordinators Update – Phil McClellan
The State of ORMAP
 - a. The Fund Balance sheet gives an overall view of expenditures and a historical view of expenditures in the past. This information is also posted on the ORMAP website. All grant requests were fully funded.
 - b. Fall 2006 Grant Requests Summary shows what each county has asked for this fall and a summary of what they want to do.
 - c. Changes to ORMAP site: The ORMAP website has been enhanced to allow more robust search and display capability using Goal 2 data. Users can now search based on site address, and can view the Goal 2 taxlot information to better locate the taxmap they're interested in. We are tracking site usage, and are posting a usage report on the ORMAP web site that shows a monthly total of how many people have accessed the site. The handout you received today shows how many maps are being downloaded for each county plus a running total of over a million.
3. State GIS Coordinator – Mark Kinslow for Cy Smith
Cy has been working with folks to explain the need for a state / county partnership to address the issue of data sharing...among other things. Currently, if someone

wants to receive ORMAP data, DOR will refer them back to the county rather than send them the data. Administratively, it is too difficult to try to manage the different needs/issues each county has regarding data sharing for DOR to try to be the ORMAP data distributor. Cy's effort will involve meeting with affected parties (mostly counties and other local governments) to assess concerns and opportunities. Meetings have been scheduled at various locations around the state in order to start the process.

Dean: The issues center on data and ownership information. DAS has proposed that we make this happen faster. Thus far it has evolved into the concept of a partnership. The way to make that work is to build trust between counties, state agencies and users. We are working to develop a plan with that in mind. It may involve legislation or agreements.

Right now, we are trying to obtain input and feedback from potential users. The partnership between the counties and DOR is held up as an example of a good partnership but it has to fit into the bigger concept. ORMAP is still not available as a collective source to the folks who need it. The agreement approach is unwieldy and unworkable with it involves too many agreements (potentially hundreds of jurisdictions). A concept of a partnership would entail the need for governance, protection of data and a decision as to what an agreement will entail.

The purpose of the meetings that Cy has set up is to get input, understand concerns and make sure we don't overlook anything. Once this process is over, the goal is to come back to the advisory committee with a plan.

Meetings have been planned for LaGrande, Prineville, Medford, Tillamook, Eugene, and Portland. Cy will also meet with different organizations such as surveyors, GIS professionals, key stakeholder groups, AOC.

Mark: Without the ability to share data, we cannot achieve the vision of ORMAP.

4. Tech Group Update – Mark Kinslow, Phil McClellan

Goal 4 Recommendations: It has been a concern of the tech group that goal 4 is not realistic. Counties were struggling with how they can know when they had reached goal 4. The tech group has come up with recommendations.

Exception Areas: Examples would be federal lands – they are not taxable, serve no business purpose to plat; towns that were platted long ago that have survey errors.

- a. Revised ORMAP Technical Specifications/Goal 4 Recommendations Handout:
Significant changes include: Goal 4 would only be 70% of taxmaps statewide.
Technical specifications would be for all taxmaps produced for ORMAP, rather

than just Goal 4. The vision for goal 4 would be more closely aligned with the original statute that focuses on the A&T function.

Dean suggested an automated sampling service using a computer program. The goal is to run these tests on or before January on sample counties.

Dan Linscheid suggested the amended changes:

- ORMAPP Goal 4: Change the word complaint to compliant
- Make the 70% numerical like the 80%
- Use Assessment and Taxation instead of information (in disclaimer portion)

Mark Labhart suggested that the group accept the present document as is with only the changes that Dan proposed, and work on goal 5 at a later time.

Mark Labhart made a motion to adopt the goal 4 changes with Dan's amendments. The Tech Group will work on a goal five for the completion of the digitized map.

All voted in favor of the motion.

Brandt suggested that this not be called the completed data set.

- b. Using the new table fields for "MapClass" and "MapRelCode" (Exception Areas):
The request is to add two new fields that will help identify these exemptions.
MapClass: Identify what type of map it would be (Urban, Rural, and Farm/Forest (Resource)).

MapRelCode: How those maps meet the technical specifications. This is how we would identify exception areas.

Pat Shaw moved to accept the Map Reliability Attribute Fields

Brandt Melick seconded the motion.

All voted in favor.

- c. Revised ORMAPP Goal 4 Methodology
Brett: Within our methodology we identified eight critical identifiers that improve the likelihood that we meet our standards. Those need to be included within the counties own methodology.

Mark Labhart moved to include the eight minimum critical elements for mapping methodology as listed in the document.

Dan asked to amend the document on page 3 to say general instead of government land office.

Karen moved to approve the first page.

Brett explained that page 1 would reduce the confusion.

It was also suggested to insert in Exhibit A, a line that says that it is not meant to exclude any other methodology.

Mike Daly seconded the motion.

All voted in favor.

- d. Goal 5: There was a consensus that Goal 5 projects would be defined as, "Projects that facilitate and improve the administration of the ad valorem property tax system (OAR 150-306.135)." This would leave the counties with greater options to choose what would benefit them most.

These projects could include, but are not limited to the following:

- a. Development or improvement of soils maps
- b. Development or improvement of other taxing layers that assist in property tax assessment (i.e. school districts, fire districts, etc.)
- c. Mapping of building footprints

Some counties that are completed to goal 4, are looking for direction for future projects that ORMAP will continue to fund.

Mark stated that the recommendation from the tech group is to focus our resources on goal 4 completion and once that is completed, focus on ad valorem features. Those features if added to the ORMAP data would help the counties to determine assessment and valuation.

Karen suggested that we focus all dollars on getting to goal 4 and then revisit this subject later.

Pat asked if we can give the tech group the charge to look at goal 5. She has concerns about some counties going out to 2013 with goal 4 and no other county being able to progress until they are done.

It was suggested that terminology be put in place that if funding is available and a county is at 100% of Goal 4, then they can apply for funding at least by year 2008.

It was also suggested that we charge the tech group to outline the goals beyond 2008 and set priorities.

We must also look at how we can support efforts to sustain the system through goal 4 and goal 5. Are there counties who may need funding to sustain these goal 4 and 5 levels?

Karen suggested and moved that the group approve the recommendation from the tech group that we will not spend ORMAP funds on anything beyond Goal 4 until at least 2008.

It was moved and seconded
The entire group voted in approval.

5. New Business

The advisory group agreed that for the next meeting the tech group will present recommendations for goal 5. This will be an agenda item for the next advisory group meeting.

The next meeting will be in April or the beginning of May. Thursday is still the chosen day of the week for the meeting. Phil will send an email with date options. Brandt suggested that advisory committee members bring a list of needs from their constituents to the next meeting

Adjourned: 12:54 PM