

**ORMAP Technical Group Minutes
September 4, 2003**

IN ATTENDANCE: Isabel Joslen, DOR; William Glover, Josephine County; Mike Johnson, Crook County; Ed Arabas, DAS/OGDC; Brian Mladenich, Lane County; Cress Bates, Lane County; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Keith Massie, Jackson County; Jim McClellan, Klamath County; Andrea Westersund, Multnomah County; Scott Jackson, DOR; Doug Holdt, DOR

Grant Review:

COUNTY: Crook County

GRANT: Combination

AMOUNT: R: \$1000, D: \$55,214

CONTACT: Mike Johnson

SUMMARY: GPS/resurvey 316 GCDB points within the Urban Growth Boundary of Prineville.

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Clearly state 316 GCDB points “will be gathered” instead of stating 316 points “need to be gathered”*
- *State that communication will occur with BLM to assure improved coordinates are incorporated back into the GCDB*
- *Attach scope of survey work to addendum*
- *State the number or percentage of parcels the project will affect.*
- *Withdraw Regional proposal and add the \$1,000 requested into the Discretionary addendum.*

COUNTY: Wheeler County

GRANT: Combination

AMOUNT: R: \$35,750, D: \$70,025

CONTACT: Tycho Granville (by phone)

SUMMARY: Create goal 2 layer from raster maps, enable standard maintenance for wheeler A&T

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

- *Identify a total cost for the pilot project*
- *Identify total number of parcels involved ~2,500*
- *The cost of \$40/taxlot is extremely high*
- *Clarify if staff or contractors will do maintenance*
- *Include an outline of the costs from the vendor*
- *The methodology proposed will not be sufficient for a goal 4 map in the urban areas and a goal 2 product cannot be used for maintenance of the tax maps. The potential exists that this method will be sufficient for a rural goal 4 map. An option was presented to revise the proposal to continue in the rural areas but only create a goal 2 product in the urban areas. This may bring the costs more inline with ORMAP guidelines because annotation in the urban areas will not need to be created. It is important that the pilot project be completed to determine if the end product will be useable for maintenance before the rest of the project continues. Add language that project will not go forward until the Department of Revenue approves the pilot project area.*

COUNTY: Baker County

GRANT: Regional

AMOUNT: \$10,000

CONTACT: Kerry Savage (by phone)

SUMMARY: Hire consultant/coordinator to develop plan, status, and partnerships

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Further document support from neighboring counties*
- *Work with the business plan template as a guideline for the plan*
- *Clearly state and identify that this project will address ownership information, edge matching, and a course of action established*
- *Because of the cross county aspect and planning nature of the project, ORMAP Coordinator should be involved with the project and assist as needed*
- *Detail the pricing structure*
- *Add information about producing goal 2 shapefile*

COUNTY: Columbia County

GRANT: Discretionary

AMOUNT: \$108,219

CONTACT: Scott Hoelscher (by phone)

SUMMARY: Convert 126 taxmaps, 4815 taxlots, 158 control points, fund consultant

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Identify what is currently completed*
- *State estimated total cost of goal 4 product and required control so ORMAP knows how much to expect Columbia County to ask for*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- *Because of the high cost of the project, a detailed business plan should be required before the grant is approved*

COUNTY: Tillamook County

GRANT: Discretionary

AMOUNT: \$ 75,000

CONTACT: Teri Gaffney (by phone)

SUMMARY: 15,000 tax parcels complying with goal 3 and 4.

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Clearly state when goal 4 is expected to be finished*
- *Resolve discrepancies with the project schedules in the grant document*
- *Clearly state in section II.A what the deliverable is*
- *Identify where in the county the project is to take place*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- *Because of the high cost of the project, a detailed business plan addressing project details and unique issues should be required before the grant is approved*

COUNTY: Clackamas County
GRANT: Regional
AMOUNT: \$ 25,000
CONTACT: Eric Bohard (by phone)
SUMMARY: Remap taxlots as continuation of taxlot project
TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:
Recommend funding.

COUNTY: Harney County
GRANT: Discretionary
AMOUNT: \$ 16,520
CONTACT: Richard Jennings (by phone)
SUMMARY: 32 monument location, 32 GPS points, remap to better control, research
TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:
Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Identify how many taxlots are in the county and how many of those this project will affect.*
- *Due to datum conversion issues, the Tech group recommends identifying that the points will be collected in NAD 83/91. This will result in more accurate points that can be converted back to NAD 27 if that is what the county desires.*

COUNTY: Klamath County
GRANT: Regional
AMOUNT: \$ 35,000
CONTACT: Jim McClellan
SUMMARY: Collect survey points and create control layer for use in taxlot remapping
TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:
Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Due to datum conversion issues, the Tech group recommends identifying that the points will be collected in NAD 83/91. This will result in more accurate points that can be converted back to NAD 27 if that is what the county desires.*
- *Identify the number of parcels in the county and in the UGB affected by this project.*
- *Any points that correspond with the GCDB will be submitted to BLM for inclusion in their database*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- *The tech group would like to see a more detailed ORMAP Business plan.*

COUNTY: Curry County
GRANT: Regional
AMOUNT: \$ 99,550
CONTACT: Keith Massie
SUMMARY: 182 GPS control points and remap all rural areas in the county.
TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:
Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Identify how many control points are GCDB and how many are other type of control.*
- *How much of the county remains to be done once this grant is completed*
- *What additional grant requests can ORMAP expect (funding amounts)*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- *Due to contract policies, ORMAP is only able to accept proposals that are for a year in length. Extensions to contracts can be given as needed but proposals should not exceed one year. In order to meet those requirements this proposal needs to be redrafted on a one-year basis, divided into multiple years if needed.*
- *The tech group would like to see a more detailed ORMAP Business plan.*

COUNTY: Curry County

GRANT: Regional

AMOUNT: \$ 5,000

CONTACT: Keith Massie

SUMMARY: Purchase server for GIS Taxlot data

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding.

COUNTY: Jackson County

GRANT: Discretionary

AMOUNT: \$ 62,200

CONTACT: Keith Massie

SUMMARY: Continue remapping project, 100 maps per year.

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend funding with addendum containing:

- *Resubmit pricing based on a per taxlot basis.*

COUNTY: Polk County

GRANT: Discretionary

AMOUNT: \$ 26,400

CONTACT: Dean Anderson

SUMMARY: Test ARCGIS and geodatabase for A&T, develop macros for use by anyone who desires, refine plan

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

There was disagreement among Tech Group Members on this proposal. The majority recommends funding and saw this as a valuable project that many A&T programs will benefit from through increased efficiency, cross county collaboration, modernizing towards supported software, and integration with assessors data and they recommend funding. The minority are cautious with funding and see this as a valuable project but question the relevance of this project towards building a goal 4 map and if the components of this project should be developed simultaneously or separately.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

Summary of the Advisory Committee policy meeting held in June of 2003

What kind of request qualifies for ORMAP funds?

Main priority is to build the assessors map because of the statute. Additional benefits (such as GIS) that can be built in during that process should be considered important as well.

Action: DOR will be working with the Tech Group on developing a model that will include the main components of an assessor's maps. A report will be given to the Advisory Committee at a special meeting or at the fall meeting.

Should ORMAP fund maintenance of Goal 1 maps?

The question was raised how much would this cost.

- a) How many counties still have Mylar maps?
- b) How many maps do they still maintain by hand and not digitally?
- c) Of those that are maintained by hand, what would be the estimate cost incur when preparing for the goal 1 site?
- d) On average, what number of maps will require scanning due to updates per quarter?

The committee also clarified that the goal 1 site will not be replaced when goal 2 is realized but will continue as a source for digital assessor maps.

Action: The committee will wait on making a recommendation until the information requested is presented.

1.1 Should we fund personnel for ORMAP projects and under what conditions (existing staff, over time for existing staff, temporary staff)?

Action: To focus the approval of grants on the deliverables as oppose to what resources the county could or could not use. The committee recognizes that the current process will identify if the proposed project is cost effective, the timeline is achievable and if the project is technically sound.

This approach will require grants to detail the actual deliverable to be produced with the funds and will provide for an objective way to measure the progress as well as providing accountability for the funds.

2. If multi-year projects are reviewed and approved, what type of funding commitment is the Advisory Committee making?

Business plans are important in this process. Because of funding issues, we can not guarantee funding through 2008. Once detailed business plans are reviewed and approved the grant approval process could be streamlined assuming all goals of the business plan are being met in a timely manner. From this discussion the Advisory Committee discussed their role in the program and how it was changing. They will focus on policy decisions instead of approving grants.

Action: The committee reaffirmed the requirement to have all counties present their business plans outlining their approach to reach goal 4 when requesting funds. They further stated that the business plan will be the measuring tool that the Tech Group and

DOR will use when reviewing all grants for funding. Once the business plan is reviewed by the Tech Group and approved by DOR using the ORMAP criteria and verification has been made that the current project is within their business plan funds can be allocated for the county. The funding of the projects will be based only on the current project amount being requested.

3. Are the current funding programs working? Do we need to have two programs? If both, what are the criteria for each program? How about the business plan—is it county based or region based?

Currently counties like the regional fund structure. It was identified that there was no difference between the types of grants that are being approved from the two funds. The Advisory Committee wants to support a funding structure that assists the counties in developing their budgets and in working with neighboring counties.

Action: There was no recommendation on this item.

Additional Information: To support county desires and business practices the regional funds will remain unchanged. The formula used to allocate the regional funding will be reviewed and updates made to each counties number of tax lots and contribution amounts to assure the most current values are used. Individual county allocations will be published in quarterly reports along with regional totals. The funding structure of ORMAP will be reviewed in the future as required to better meet county needs and fund administration.

During the Sept. 4th meeting, the Tech group identified that a regional plan should be created and on file with DOR and available on the website. This will identify how the region has decided to use their funds and help with the review of the grants.

Changes to the process

- Tech group will continue to approve grants as we do now.
- Additionally the Tech Group will review business plans to ‘pre-approve’ future grants. Business plans should outline a path to the ORMAP product outlined in the goals.
- Advisory committee will recommend approval of the final ORMAP product we are working towards and thus ‘Advise’ us on what data will be most useful to the community.
- As counties complete the plan template or other forms of the business plan, we can review and make updates as needed.
- These detailed plans will give us:
 - An idea of how much goal 4 will cost.
 - Identify difficulties before they occur.
 - Give the tech group and Advisory Committee the whole picture regarding each county and the statewide plan.
- We discussed hardware and software grants. While there is enough money, the Advisory Committee discussed having hardware and software grants that are below the guideline amounts not needing a technical group review and just receive approval from DOR.

Discussion during the September 4th meeting found that the Tech Group was in favor of this so DOR administration staff will move forward defining this process.

Revised Goals Update

- Review revised goal 2 and 3
- Upon agreement, continue with revised goal 4.
- Data access is the main sticking point we are running into at goal 2 and beyond

We will take comments during the next 2 weeks, meet with the sub committee and discuss any suggestions as well as develop goal 4. Then discuss goal 4 at the final tech group meeting following the grant review. Then the revised goals will be ready for presentation to the advisory committee.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

At the next Tech Group meeting, Sept 25th, 2003 in Grants Pass, the grant review process will occupy a short portion of the meeting. As a result, we will also identify policy issues for the Advisory Committee to address and discuss the revised goals, the business plan template, and the role of the Tech Group.