

ORMAP Tech Group
December 9, 2002
DOR Salem Field Office
Salem, OR

Attending: Marc Thomas, Dan Malaer, Isabel Joslen, Dan Linchied, Alan Holsted, Brett Juul, Gerald Longton, John Prychun, Matthew Krusemark, Andrea Westersund, Cy Smith, Dean Anderson, Ed Arabas, Jim Bender, John Minor, Roger Livingston, Steve Ganoë, Scott Jackson, Doug Sackinger and Teri Gaffney.

Agenda Item: *Data Exchange Standard*

Several issues about handling taxlots within the ORMAP standard were discussed.

Issue #1) A taxlot is in multiple pieces (many to 1) because a right of way or water or some non-taxlot thing divides it. Shape file can either be created that are separate multiple pieces with the same taxlot ID, or a shape file can “merge” the piece into one polygon. What should the standard be?

Action: *Update Data Exchange Standard to: Use multiple part polygons for split taxlots with “No” duplicate records.*

Issue #2) A taxlot has multiple assessor records (1 to many). There are many variations of this, the suffixed State-Ids, such as -U1 or -A1. With the -U1 accounts, the taxlot has many undivided interests---many people own an interest in the whole. With the -A1 type, there is a master record (with no suffix) that contains the reference to the sub-accounts. What should the standard be?

Action: *Update Data Exchange Standard: Under “Ownership (optional)” Digital Table rename to “Multi Account” remove optional portion and increase from 16 to 24 character the MapTaxlot and add a Secondary Map Taxlot with 24 characters to the exchange standard.*

Agenda Item: *Goal 1 Enhancements*

Improvements to the assessor map image site were discussed with the consensus that there is a real need to improve the ease with locating individual maps. Suggestion is to develop an index map (by county) down to the section level with individual addresses linked to their respective section.

Action: *OGDC will develop an ORMAP discretionary proposal for the Spring 2003 funding cycle. Tech group will develop a recommendation to present along with the proposal to the Advisory Committee. Proposal will accelerate the development of Goal 2. Identify as such with funding the county portion in a similar way that Goal 1 was funded for its’ development.*

Note: DOR will need to contact assessors about proposal. Proposal may require identifying information that they don’t have and may have to develop.

Action: *Update Goal 1 technical design image type from tiff to: Prefer pdf with second choice tiff.*

Agenda Item: *Goal 2-4 Clarifications*

The Goal Progress chart is misleading. The Advisory Committee wanted a simple chart to show the status for each county by goal. The tech group needs more detail to better determine the progress each county is making towards these respective goals. Goals themselves need further explanation for counties to determine their status. The deliverable is a shape file.

Action: *Establish a subcommittee to develop a detailed explanation of the criteria for Goals 2-4. Subcommittee will meet and bring back this detail to the tech group at another special*

meeting to be held PRIOR to the January 23 due date for Spring 2003 ORMAP Funding proposals.

DOR, will after this meeting send a spreadsheet to all counties asking them to estimate, based on detailed criteria, where they are in completing the ORMAP goals.

Subcommittee members are: Andrea Westersund, Dean Anderson, Cy Smith, Steve Ganoe and Doug Sackinger.

Agenda Item: *Unique Parcel Identifier*

Tabled till next special tech group meeting to be held Monday, January 13, 2003 at the DOR Salem Field Office from 9:00 AM to 12:00 Noon.

Meeting adjourned 12:05