

**ORMAP Technical Group Minutes
September 25, 2003**

IN ATTENDANCE: Mike Schneyder, Josephine County; William Glover, Josephine County; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Tom Brateng, Polk County; Keith Massie, Jackson County; Jim McClellan, Klamath County; Scott Jackson, DOR; Doug Holdt, DOR

PHONE PARTICIPATION: Teri Gaffney

SUBMITTING COMMENTS: Andrea Westersund, Dan Malaer, Eric Bohard

Grant Review:

COUNTY: Crook County

GRANT: Combination

AMOUNT: D: \$56,214

CONTACT: Mike Johnson

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

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

- *Recommend funding (Addendum approved)*

COUNTY: Wheeler County

GRANT: Combination

AMOUNT: R: \$35,750, D: \$16,225

CONTACT: Tycho Granville (by phone)

SUMMARY: Create goal 4 layer from raster maps, collect control points for Spray, Mitchell, Fossil, enable standard maintenance for wheeler A&T

TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:

- *Recommend Funding (Addendum approved)*

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 (Addendum approved)*

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 (Addendum 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 (Addendum 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 (Addendum approved)*

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 (Addendum approved)*

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 (Addendum approved)*

COUNTY: Curry County

GRANT: Regional
AMOUNT: \$ 5,000
CONTACT: Jim Kolen
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 (Addendum approved)*

COUNTY: Polk County
GRANT: Discretionary
AMOUNT: \$ 26,400
CONTACT: Dean Anderson
SUMMARY: 160 hours by ESRI technical consulting staff creating custom scripts that make using the software more efficient.
TECH GROUP RECOMMENDATION:
This grant is still in discussion. Late comments caused the need for revisions to the addendum and additional discussion. Those present at the meeting were in favor of the grant though some who did not attend submitted comments stating their concerns. The majority still favor this grant while the minority do not approve. The proposal will record yes and no Tech Group votes for each section in the grant that will be presented to the Advisory Committee. Those attending the meeting or submitting comments to DOR before the meeting dates will have their votes counted. Additional discussion is continuing as needed.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION:

Goal 2 Status and Completion

- We reviewed three status maps, Goal 2 Projected Completion Status, Reasons for not Completing Goal 2, and County Edge Matching Status. These three maps, updated as needed, will be placed on the website, www.ormap.org, to allow people to view them at any time.
- We discussed those counties not planning on meeting goal 2 and if they felt it was important to have 100% completion. The tech group felt that for the seven counties not planning to complete goal 2, ORMAP and possibly other state agencies could coordinate and fund parcel development for those counties by digitizing from scanned assessor maps tied to the best control available. Past goal 2 conversion projects have cost \$0.50 – \$3.00 per taxlot. ORMAP Coordinator will research how many tax parcels remain to convert for each county not forecasted to reach goal 2 and develop cost estimates. The coordinator will collect support from those agencies eager to have access to a goal 2 product.

Review Revised ORMAP goals 2 and 3 as well as discuss components important to a goal 4

The goals 2 and 3 were reviewed and additional comments made for consideration by the tech group subcommittee. Changes to original goal text are in *italics* and underlined.

GOAL 2

Proposed word change to number 5:

FGDC Compliant Metadata shall be *developed and* available from the Dept. of Revenue for the taxlot polygon shapefile and table attributes provided the data follows ORMAP data exchange standards.

Proposed change to number 6:

Because of the popularity of the goal 1 site, submitting goal 1 images at least quarterly (as is currently done) is the recommendation of the Sept 25, 2003 Tech Group. Taxlot shapefile and attribute table updates would still be annually.

Proposed change to number 10: (proposed changes underlined and in italics)

10. Data content viewer website provided by Dept. of Revenue that allows:

10.1 Anonymous Access available *to the public*

10.2 Query and Zoom/Pan functionality

10.3 Public access to ownership information at the counties discretion

10.4 A strong disclaimer to accompany all web access to data

10.5 No shapefile download availability at this time

11. GIS Shapefile access and delivery

11.1 A license is signed before the GIS Shapefile is released *from the county*. Department of Revenue will be the steward of Statewide ORMAP data licenses.

11.2 Department of Revenue has access to the GIS Shapefile. All other government agency access to the GIS Shapefile is at the discretion of the county

11.2 Shapefile access, including Ownership information, is available to all Oregon State agencies and data access fees will not be charged to Oregon State agencies. Counties denying access or charging fees to Oregon State agencies will not qualify for ORMAP funding

11.3 Public access to the GIS Shapefile *continues to be* at the discretion of the county

11.4 GIS Shapefile is not for redistribution unless *stated in the license agreement*

11.5 Including ownership information is at the counties discretion

11.6 A strong disclaimer will accompany all ORMAP distributed data

Suggested Additions:

It was suggested to add Tax Code Polygons to the Goal 2 definition. These can be derived from the taxlot attributes.

GOAL 3

All changes to goal 2 also apply to goal 3. In addition to those changes, the following suggestions were made.

Proposed changes to number 7: Township corners may not be appropriate for some counties who have unfound township corners so the recommendation was to remove the minimum of township corners from the goal. (Tillamook County) Also, talk with county surveyors to assure all goals are attainable.

Proposed changes to number 9: Because of the lack of interest and for reasons of reporting project status, the suggestion was made to remove edge matching from goal 3. Instead of having the edge matching complete, the suggestion was made for each county to complete a plan for edge matching with its' neighboring counties. This will make reporting on project

status easier and not limit one counties progress with ORMAP goals to the progress or willingness of its neighbors.

Suggested Additions:

The original goal 3 included a component to measure progress towards goal 4. This measure of progress has value and some members feel should be included in a finalized goal 3.

Elements of an Assessor Map

It was stated that a more complete list of the components of an assessor's map are included in the digital section of the Map Manual published by the Department of Revenue. There was some concern that with the current wording, if adopted this document would open the door for all types of funding requests relating to data mentioned in the county's strategic plans. Because of the focus and intense resources required to develop taxlot data for the State of Oregon the recommendation by the Sept. 25, 2003 Tech Group is that this document not be used to define what could and could not qualify for funding. It was recommended that ORMAP funding continue to be directed towards the effective creation of accurate taxlot polygons and control points.

Components suggested to add to the list include:

- Digital Ortho Imagery
- Hydrology line and boundary information

Review Business Plan Template comments and changes

There were many comments on the business plan. Many counties felt it was too long and would take too much time to fill out.

General comments included:

- Use consistent, specific, terminology throughout the document
- For inventory and project sharing purposes, request taxlot software information.
- Flexible reporting for status information to integrate with counties existing reporting methods.
- Document if the assessor and county surveyor agree with the plan
- Percent of parcels that involve water boundaries.
- Where GLO points are recovered and where they are not
- In addition to these general comments, we discussed putting the entire business plan on the web for completion with a wizard type interface and storage in a database. This would allow plans to be stored dynamically, allow for easy updates as required, facilitate compilation for reporting and status maps, and simplify the whole plan. The plan completion process would follow a wizard format and in order to be eligible for ORMAP funding the county would be required to step through the wizard to keep the plan accurate. Keith Massie and Jackson County volunteered to put a proposal together to develop the system. Initial estimates from Keith are between 3,000-5,000 dollars which would (if approved) be funded by ORMAP. In order to refine the business plan, the ORMAP Coordinator requested tech group members mark questions from the draft business plan or submit additional questions they feel are important components in a plan so we can finalize a the draft this fall. It was felt that for simplicity and to quantifying the results, if possible questions should be presented such that they can be filled out with yes/no buttons and drop down lists. The goal is to have these finalized questions available on the web for use by the next grant cycle.

The 2004 ORMAP Grant Application, Process, Meeting Dates and Locations

- It was suggested to shorten the time between the grant due dates and the two tech group review periods.
- Dates will be stated clearly defining meeting dates, grant due dates, final review question dates, and addendum due dates.
- To assure those reviewing the grants all receive the same information and meetings run smooth, all documents need to be submitted by the due dates or grants will not be considered for that cycle. All documents will be posted at the same time.
- The tech group will not review hardware/software grants provided the ORMAP fund is positive, the request is the counties first for such materials, the amount is within the ORMAP guidelines.
- To enhance participation from those counties unable to make the trip to meetings, we will encourage counties to submit the grant applications with their comments filled out.
- It was suggested that moving the Salem Tech Group meetings to Portland may allow for additional participation by the Northwest region and the North Central Region.
- On the website containing the grants, include a document that summarizes the grants for that cycle. This will aid counties to find proposals similar to ones they are hoping to create.
- A combination grant option, for those counties who want to have the same project funded from two different sources of ORMAP money will be included.

Define the Tech Group Role, Structure, and Approval Process

- The Tech Group is comfortable with its role as the Technical review of grants and plans. Some questions remain about its' structure and how to encourage participation, especially from rural counties.
- The Tech Group is concerned that reviewing the completed business plans as the template is drafted will take more time than the current system will allow.
- Some Tech Group members would like to formalize Tech Group membership and discuss implementing a voting structure as a solution to proposals where they are unable to obtain consensus.
- We discussed the meeting locations. It was identified that reaching out to rural counties is important for the program. Some are concerned that the rural Tech Group meetings do not have enough participation. Portland was discussed as an alternative to the Salem meeting in an attempt to shorten the travel times and encourage participation from the Northwest and North Central regions.

Identify policy issues the Tech Group would like the Advisory Committee to address

Data Access issue. The tech group is having a difficult time defining the goals because the data access issue is not resolved. Counties would like to know what will be expected of them so they can begin discussion with how their own policies may conflict with ORMAP data access policy.

Additional Items Discussed:

- ORMAP Coordinator will be making county visits throughout the fall. These visits will be used to encourage participation in ORMAP, distribute information from Advisory Committee, Tech Group and Dept. of Revenue, foster communication, and gather project status information.

- To help clarify the ORMAP process, a document will be created that states how the processes within the ORMAP program work. This will provide a clear picture for participants of what to expect from the program.
- Administrative Rules will be written that further clarify the statutes governing ORMAP.