

## ORMAP TECHNICAL GROUP MINUTES

Thursday, February 27, 2003  
9:00 AM to 3:00 Field Office  
4275 Commercial Street SE  
Salem, OR 97302

Attendees: Jurek Kolman – E.S.U., Cress Bates – Lane County, Phil Costaggini – Lane County, Brian Mladenich – Lane County, Bob Thurman – Lane County, Steve Ganoe – Marion County, Ed Arabas – DAS, Keith Massie – Jackson County, Dan Malaer – Washington County, Andrea Westersund – Multnomah County, Isabel Joslen – DOR, Teri Gaffney – Tillamook County, Dan Rosenbalm – Polk County, Dan Linscheid – Yamhill County, Mike Johnson – Crook County, Lled Smith – Crook County, Cindi Turula – Yamhill County, Eric Bohard – Clackamas County, Brett Juul – DOR, Rodney Therriault – DOR, William Cozzens – DOR, Scott Jackson – DOR, Barbara Mitchell - DOR

### **Agenda item:** ORMAP Update - Isabel Joslen

- We were able to use the new application packet this time around and it appears to be working well. Isabel asked for feedback from the tech group to see if any changes needed to be made.
- Interviewed and hired Doug Holdt for ORMAP coordinator. Doug has GIS as well as cartography background. Scheduled to start April 1<sup>st</sup>. Will be at the advisory committee meeting April 24<sup>th</sup>. Doug is living in Hawaii and will be moving back to Oregon. Doug has worked with Mark Kinslow at the Dept of Forestry.
- A special meeting of the Advisory Committee has been called they will discuss policy and strategic plans. The tentative date is March 19. They will meet in the Fishbowl at DOR.

## SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

### **Agenda item:** *Lake County* - Discretionary \$10,800 (conference call 9:10, Assessor Phil Israel)

- Discussion before the conference call: Discretionary: attempting to scan deeds. No agreement to do mapping at this time, but plan to with the Department of Revenue in early 2004. Only goal three and nothing regarding goal 4?  
Is the \$800 scanner for production? No. Who is going to be doing scanning? IDS. Does the price include indexing? Reason for scanning deeds is that they will be used in the creation of the maps but will obviously not use each and everyone. We need justification in his plan for the use of deeds for the upcoming map conversion.  
Inconsistent time frames. When is the actual delivery? Is there someone at DOR that will be able to talk to individuals to help them get through the process? Answer: yes Carolyn Sunderman. Strategic plan is incomplete.

- Summary of concerns: Scanning of deeds, does it include indexing? Timeline dates clarify. How does the deed scanning relate to goals 3 and 4? Strategic plan needs to be reworked. All comments were more directed toward the discretionary.

**Action:** Complete Strategic Plan and answer questions with a re-write or an addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Lake County* - Regional \$20,500

- Would complete only goal 3? Confusion on completion dates.

**Action:** Discuss additional GPS control and timeline through an addendum.

## SOUTHEAST REGION

**Agenda item:** *Malheur County* - Discretionary \$50,000 (conference call 9:30, Surveyor Jim Kimberling)

- Question – Has this gone beyond ORMAP accuracy goals? Do we accept better control by counties and does ORMAP pay for it?
- Questions – You are requesting to spend 20,000 for 100 points. \$200 per GS point? ORMAP grant to cover half, which would be 100 points. Why is your cost higher than the norm? Higher accuracy?
- Answer - 200 points distributed over most of the county. Small towns and travel time, Ontario 110 points bids just under \$100 very simple for contractors. Extra time no matter what accuracy standard because of the travel distance.
- Dan from Wash. Co – what accuracy are you getting. Bids for Ontario, contractor got with in 0.1500 accuracy. Specified to match that in this requisition at least at half a foot.
- Ed’s question to DOR contribution to ORMAP 50% ORMAP contributes another \$30,000? Dor should match county contribution? Dor matches 50% on conversion and county comes up with the rest.
- Is IDS over committing to what they actually can do versus what they say they can?

**Action:** Recommend to move forward to Advisory Committee with explanation of \$200 cost as relayed to the group. Malheur County to provide addendum.

***Discussion after conference call: Addendum or revise current proposal?***

***Consensus of opinion is: addendums should be submitted for minor clarifications, two-page limit on addendum? Note this change in the packet.***

## NORTH CENTRAL REGION

**Agenda item:** *Sherman County* - Discretionary \$4,500 (conference call 10:00, GIS Analyst Tycho Granville)

- Question – Why was this submitted as a discretionary instead of regional?
- Answer – This helps the county more than the region.
- What department will house the computer? Assessor's office. How does that help them reach goal 4? GIS function. By purchasing, this does not mean they are at goal 4. This computer will allow them to have the GIS functions. What is the data sharing policy? Has to be stated that this will make it available to the citizens of Sherman Co.

***ACTION:*** Tech group moves forward to Advisory Committee with addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Gilliam County* – Discretionary \$ 2,190 (conference call 10:15, Appraiser Dave Messenger)

- Question - Does ORMAP fund replacement equipment? What's our policy?
- Answer - The first time they have requested ORMAP funds for equipment Fund replacement hardware. They have proved there is a need and this is their first request.
- Why is it a discretionary and not a regional? Regional would go to other counties. Each county is making their own proposals. Why are they not working together on it as a region?

***ACTION:*** Move forward to Advisory Committee as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Wasco County* - Discretionary \$80,000 (conference call, Tycho)

Relationship scanning deeds to ORMAP. Help assessor's office be able to have them available. Goal 1 was scanning tax maps. Goal 1 was not for scanning deeds. How does it help ormap? Scanning all of them can be over kill. Polygon's created? Yes, and DOR maintains maps and would use deeds as part of the maintenance process. Would it save you money? Yes, as we do maintenance we are provided with a copy. Pricing agreements with data licensing? Any use of their data would come with a very high price. Need additional information on how it links to ORMAP goal 4.

Send to the advisory committee because of the size of the issue.

Flag as Advisory Committee needs to answer policy question.

Tycho will decide if he wants to do an addendum.

Amend or statement on how it's justified.

DOR only gets deeds as maintenance occurs.

Scanning – can of worms. Washington County tied to completing goal 4. County only went back to 1998. That is how they justified it. Efficiency issue also.

Look at the business plan and see if it makes sense. Is it a resource and is it justified in your plan?

***Action:*** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee and flag scanning issue.

## Northeast Management Region

**Agenda item:** *NE Management* – Discretionary \$ 23,911.10 (conference call 10:30, Cartographer Dawn Smith)

Ortho photos – Took dates from DOQ map on website. Dates were off the website. For page 3 of 5 section – just needs to be clear in overview.

How do they fit into goals? Map productions have been complete. DOR converting Union Co. Dor stated it would be beneficial. Maintenance Morrow Co. Tie to why we are spending ORMAP money for aerial photos if it would be used for something specific to the goals

***ACTION:*** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee with addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Umatilla County* - Discretionary \$40,000 (conference call, Tracie)

- Questions? Estimate from vendor is \$46/map. Convert and re-register it. Register current maps and edge map. Not covered: getting control – continuing to update control. Half of county maps are at goal 2 and half at goal 3. Trying to get away from a CAD system to full GIS system. Polygon will have accuracy statements along with them. Clarify that it is a goal 2. Add in a server, G.O. media server. Short learning curve. How many taxlots? Approximately 43,000.

***ACTION:*** Move forward to Advisory Committee with goal 2 addendum

Suggested change in process: For simple requests for hardware or software. Have DOR approve cost of hardware and or software. ORMAP coordinator can go through and do the first cut. Change in process – DOR to come up with policy and use ORMAP coordinator. Should formalize this process.

**Agenda item:** *Union County* - Discretionary \$21,320 (conference call after 10:30, Appraiser Linda Hill)

- Requesting funds for the additional cost of the second year of a two-year digital map conversion project. Previous year ORMAP request was approved. Additional procedure that DOR is using in map conversion is reason for request.

***Action:*** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee as presented

## R-Map Region

**Agenda item:** *Clackamas County* – Discretionary \$5,716 (conference call 11:00, Cartographer Craig Ferris)

- Part of \$1800 is a retroactive request – this job was performed in June 2002. ORMAP has not had a request for retroactive funds. No one has requested before. Made copies in Jan but delivered first c.d. to state in June.
- Anyone in county using scanned images? Planning dept using it instead of going to website goes directly to them. Plan map application. Dual system exists. 908 maps have changes. Just for maps that have changed. Estimate is 2000 maps yearly based on what they did in 2002 and what was done the previous year.
- Would not have started this project if it had not been done for ORMAP? No.
- Users that are gaining from this are using maps as a result of this. Other departments are using and agencies purchasing. Could this be resubmitted at a reduce funding? Answer Yes. Right now there is no profit just a recoup of money.

**Action:** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee – flag as a policy issue because of retroactive request. This subject needs to be discussed.

**Agenda item:** *Clackamas County* – Regional \$20,000

- Mapping is unique in Clackamas County split departments not connected in any way. Are the two departments working together to get to their goal? GIS staff feels that the assessor will eventually accept product and start using. Currently ALL assessor's maps are continuing to be maintained manually. No plan in place to begin migrating new controlled maps into the assessor's map maintenance process. Need to see strategic plan.
- Assessor's office not comfortable with GIS product. City accepts products and they are using it. Everything, assessor's information has been developed and is displayed on the maps. Have done quality control.
- Need to get the county done in order to get the assessor into using the product. Dual maintenance will continue until October of 2008.

**ACTION:** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Multnomah County* – Regional \$75,000

- As a region other partners contributing – share county by county did not send in a proposal last time that is why the amount is so high.

**ACTION:** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Washington County* – Discretionary \$26,300

- 45% of maps are digital.

**ACTION:** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Washington County* – Regional \$ 26,300

**ACTION:** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR as presented.

## Northwest Region

**Agenda item:** *Clatsop County* - Discretionary \$16,200 (Conference call Doug)

Questions: Complete water body layer and complete hydrology layer are they the same? Two layers that water body and one is a stream layer. The focused on is the water body layer. It causes the most problems. They and DOR will use the water body layer. Using in combination for what was on the original maps versus the actual shore lines. They will have to go back an update after they get them from DOR. Control on water body layer? Yes, 2002 Ortho photos by ORMAP funding. They will use these to verify the water body photos. Tighten up the water body lines. Update all the water cartography in the county starting with water bodies. After that, will move on to the line work and Cartographer will develop control for the maps. This is a continuation of an ORMAP first round funded project. There is a verifiable amount of work to be done and an expectation of what will be accomplished. Two temporary employees with start up cost for training. Have been using college students and has been working well.

This is very important as we have a lot of water issues. Modeling to future flooding. We will start with the major streams like the Columbia and work on the larger rivers and work their way down.

- Addendums to address these issues clarify cost to the county and what it would cost to do this. Completed at a goal 3 and going for goal 4. Asking for casual help can only work 600 hrs. It actually is only one project.
- Question to be answered on addendum – Find out the how many taxlots are affected by the water boundary?

***ACTION:*** On addendum show the deliverable that is measurable. Reflect what you are going to be able to do.

## Central Region

**Agenda item:** *Crook County* – Regional \$4,800

- Question – attribute to the taxlot? Pilot section to run it. Tech group would like a write up on the process they are using for future reference.
- In proposal states \$4000 to do the job, why not have DOR do it? No resources at this time. Under Section 3 project design – it is hard to understand how you come up with the money if you don't know who is going to do the work. Careful job of making image fit to GMCD. Distorted separately will this amount enable you to do the job? This is also part of the salary of the person that is doing the job.
- Only piece of data is holding us back are the tiff's. Why do you need them they are in the background? Assessors office uses them to evaluate their data.
- DOR maintains this county. How is this getting us to the ORMAP goals? What is the next step? They have a goal 2 map. How does this help you get to goal 4?

- Clarify justification; how they are going to do it. Something by next month to see if there is an adjustment in cost.

***ACTION:*** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR with an addendum with explanation around the goals.

***Agenda item:*** *Deschutes County* – Discretionary \$20,000

- Both the discretionary request and the regional request are one in the same. ORMAP standards depend on the area they are in and what they are using. Bill Koffman part of surveyor’s office. Counties GPS equipment.
- Generate control in urban areas – 120 digital maps addressing 175 manual maintained maps funding will include these maps.
- Questions about data sharing and the availability of data. Do we need a policy for ORMAP funding? This issue will eventually need clarification.

***ACTION:*** Tech group to move to Advisory Committee as presented.

***Agenda item:*** *Deschutes County* – Regional \$22,600

- This is a continuation of a previously funded project.

***ACTION:*** Tech Group to move forward to the Director of DOR as presented.

***Agenda item:*** *Jefferson County* – Regional \$4,800 (Conference call)

- Questions: How did you come up with 96 as opposed to 396? Unclear on proposal who is to do the work and ORMAP standards? A&T system? Time spent addressing existing data make sure it will make the ORMAP data exchange standards. Will tax lot data layer equal the ORMAP data exchange standards. Make sure Jefferson County layers are going to be equal with other counties. They will do the work so that the attributes will be there. Are you going to be able to do it in 20 hours? Have information just don’t have it set up in the same way ORMAP data exchange standards. County strategic plan? They need a strategic plan that will take them through to goal 4. GIS contract getting help on contribution. Accuracy on data they have now. Report on accuracy of parcel lines per township. They would contribute the difference in the fee for the contractor and what ORMAP would contribute.

***ACTION:*** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR with an addendum of the county strategic plan showing the steps that Jefferson County is taking to get to Goal 4.

***NOTE: if you are going to submit a request... you must have a strategic plan as part of the application plan. We will need to enforce it!***

Southwest Region

**Agenda item:** *Curry County* - Discretionary \$4,492

- DOR tax mapping guideline not in step with ORMAP standard or goals. These are goal 4 products.
- This was changed from a Regional to a Discretionary request. The Tech Group was in agreement that we would go ahead and change our document with out having Curry County submit another proposal.

**Action:** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Curry County* - Regional \$5,400

**ACTION:** Tech group to move forward to the Director of DOR as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Lane County* – Discretionary \$23,609

- Deliverables – mainly in response to work they thought had been done on control. Met with Marc Thomas from BLM. Request to catch them up and get GCBD work done. Do control data adjustment. Use temp workers to do data entry. Keep pace with what BLM is doing.
- The tech group suggest doing an addendum stating the product description and report what will be measurable.

**Action:** Tech group moved forward to the Advisory Committee with addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Lane County* - Regional \$20,000

Two current ORMAP contracts will end in June. Would continue with the coordination and update their strategic plan. Will also, come up with a maintenance plan and plug into parcel data model in Polk County. Jackson County commented they are spending a fair amount of expense on participating with the parcel data model.

Data model does it affect the line work? If not, we have gone too far. Good parcel model will save the counties money. Wise use of money and other counties will want to participate.

Does it fit within the goal 1 thru 4? Maintaining tax mapping within a parcel tax date model. Suggest that a final document be available so that others can produce a product and that we are just not giving them money for nothing. In other words Cress is doing all the work and he will be delivering a model that might work for everyone. Is prototype useful for everyone and a fair way to use ORMAP funds? We all stand to learn from this. Research and development do we use ORMAP funds? Goal 5 discussion? We are requesting a document to be produced.

- This will directly help counties get to goal 4.

**Action:** Tech group moved forward to the Director of DOR with addendum.

## Midwest Region

**Agenda item:** *Lincoln County* - Discretionary \$23,000

Continuation of a previously funded project to fund a portion of the salary for cartography, helps get to goal 3.

We need a strategic plan.

***ACTION:*** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee as presented.

**Agenda item:** *Linn County* - Discretionary \$26,640

- How many tax lots and maps will be affected? Over 2800 tax lots and 85 maps.
- Why \$200 per GPS point? Points will be in the rural areas. Takes time to get to site and discover pin.

***ACTION:*** Tech group move forward to Advisory Committee with addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Linn County* - Regional \$10,000

- Goal 4 web base applications would allow them to interface. Preparing data to certain accuracy standards. Not sure this is something ORMAMP would fund. 300 hrs for programming.
- This is really an extension of Polk counties project, this concept has been approved. Regional strategy. Regional answer does not mean that it will meet the standards for ORMAMP. This opens up a new large category. This might be a policy issue. Should it continue to me an ORMAMP way of communicating? How does it relate to goal 4? Could see if this would be a state wide pilot. Linn County has been the pilot on this project.
- Polk County was supposed to produce a document. Some have seen the program but no document. It was requested that the document be reviewed at the next tech group meeting. This tool works with goal 2. Free to other counties once developed. All done and any county should be able to plug their data into this. This is very close to what ORMAMP approved for Lane County.
- One program lives in Linn County and one lives in Polk County. Two separate issues and they are attempting to make this one program. There doesn't appear to be a reason can't be run on the DAS server, if they can make it into one statewide project. We have an opportunity to decide if this is one that ORMAMP wants to get behind. Develop a regional perspective. That is what they are doing. Total cost to deliver? Maybe we could try to get statewide funding for this project? Project needs to be a flag as to whether it is a goal 4 or goal 5. What do we get for what we pay for? An improved website for region? Need a write up from the first project that was funded by ORMAMP.

***ACTION:*** Tech group upon review of the Polk County document will forward to the Advisory Committee with a flag on policy goal issues. Addendum will be attached.

**Agenda item:** *Polk County* – Discretionary \$10,400

- How many tax lots will be involved in this? There are 1400 tax lots.

Addendum to include 1400 tax lots in first page. Dollar amount on page one did not match page 4 \$10,200 should be \$10,400. Request is in the right amount.

**Action:** Tech group to move forward to Advisory Committee with addendum.

**Agenda item:** *Yamhill County* – Discretionary \$28,076

- Question - Do all survey control by the end of the year? Answer - Yes. Need to put in accuracy element. Higher cost for fewer points because of the location and travel.
- Ortho photo rolled into \$68 a section one mile sq. black and white. They need to go back and ask to see if they will be able to use Ortho photos again. Get confirmation on ones we already have.
- All smaller cities are to control. Next is Newburg and McMinnville and then go out to the rural area. Strategic plan has been updated. No GCDB available in this area and they are playing catch up. Percent of county done = urban areas done, rural areas are behind.
- Estimate on when you are going to get there and how much do you have left.
- Most of urban areas have been covered.

**Action:** Tech group will hold off making recommendation until we receive confirmation on the \$68 amount for ortho-photos.

**Agenda item:** *Department of Revenue* – Discretionary \$86,840

- DOR is playing catch up. Software, server, consulting and training on site for 12 people thru ESRI.
- Allowance for server exceeds the \$5,000 allowance. We have never seen a \$100,000 proposal. How much money do we have in the bank? Answer, enough to cover all discretionary requests. We have never seen anything like this!!
- DOR is adding approximately \$40,000. DOR paid \$9,900 per Arc seat yet master pricing thru federal is only \$7700. Cy will check this out.
- On tech side, approaching brand new from ESRI regarding taxlot mapping without any data modeling. Lots of questions and members are very cautious. Hardware/software and training. This is a big step and we need to see a strategic plan. Why exceed allowances set up by the committee? DOR maintains 15 counties and 160,000 parcels. Multnomah has over 250,000 parcels yet they must live by the \$5,000 allowance.
- Tech group would like to see a pilot. Start small and then move forward. This would be far more logical.

Suggest a rewrite. Consider these items:

Pilot project (does the opinion of the tech group matter?) appears to be a business decision; revenue is saying they need to go here. They are asking ORMAP to fund. Not clear how it all fits together into the 5 year plan.

Please pass all questions to DOR.

Give a concrete reason why they need to do this. Break up into smaller sections.  
They want to understand what they are proposing. Ed supports the idea just can't support the proposal.

Suggest splitting into small increments.

Give feed back on concerns to DOR – need more background.

Put on the March 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

If the request remains the same there should be a Needs Assessment. If we do that, then we need to put this proposal on hold

The concern is not that you can't do the job but have you thought of all the potential problems to the agency and the effect that this may have on the counties themselves.

**Action:** Tech Group requests that the DOR rewrite proposal and provide their strategic plan.

***Meeting Adjourned at 4:00***

***Next Tech Group meeting: Thursday, March 27, 2003 - 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM -  
DOR Salem Field Office***