

## OLIS Tech Group Meeting

Revenue Building, Room #457

Monday, January 10, 1999

1:00 , 3:00 PM

**Attending:** Scott Jackson , Facilitator, Dean Anderson, Brett Juul, Dan Malaer, Ed Arabas, Keith Massie, John Minor, John Prychun, Teri Gaffney, Carol Hall, Jim Manary

Guest: Craig Fischer, DOR

### Craig Fischer, DOR Research

(See handout: *Uses of Property Tax Data*)

Craig went over the purposes and functions of the Research Department and the types of county data his department typically uses.

### Status Survey

(See handouts of survey suggestions)

Several issues were discussed around surveying, including:

1. Accuracy of maps , this is relative to each system and the accepted level varies
2. Who the survey is for , just the counties, or the cities, utilities, etc? For now, the county level serves the group's need for a basic picture of where the state is at. As the project progresses, the survey could go to deeper levels.
3. Talking with the counties face to face helps to eliminate ambiguities and gain support for the project.

Dean suggested that there are three types of **information needed** at this time:

1. What kind of technology and expertise currently exists in each county?
2. How are the current maps related to tax lots?
3. What is the access to the maps? Is there a plan to generate revenue from the maps that are designed?

Jim discussed two levels of the **Tech Group's role**:

1. To explain where we are as a state: timeline, funding appropriate for creating a statewide map
2. To provide data to answer question and what resources are necessary achieve the mapping standards set.

The group identified four mapping levels that currently exist in the state:

1. **Paper Maps** , Mostly DOR Maintenance Counties.

Columbia, Wheeler, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Curry, Wallowa, Tillamook, Coos, Hood River, Crook, Union, Lincoln, Clatsop, Grant, Umatilla

2. **Digital with no control**

Sherman, Gilliam,

3. **Digital Tax Lots with a mix of all or some control tied to A & T**

Lane, Washington, Jackson, Clackamas, Deschutes, Wasco, Morrow, Yamhill, Douglas, Josephine, Baker

4. **DONE - County wide, "controlled" connected to a database, 1 shared database used for mapping and other GIS applications**

Polk, Linn, Multnomah, Benton, Marion, Jefferson, Harney

After working through the four mapping levels the group concluded that we basically had completed an elementary survey of the status of county mapping statewide.

#### **FOR NEXT TIME:**

1. DOR will develop state map showing the 4 mapping levels.
  1. Dean will e-mail a list defining the stages identified above with pros and cons and actions necessary to move to the next stage.
  2. Summary of Jim and Scott's county meetings.
  3. Think about where the counties should ultimately be heading.

**Next meeting:** Monday February 7, 2000

Department of Revenue, Room 457