

ORMAP Tech Group Minutes

When: Monday – January 13, 2003

Place: DOR Salem Field Office

Time: 9:00 AM – 12:00 Noon

Attendees: Ed Arabas - DAS, Andrea Westersund – Multnomah, John Prychun - DOR, Brett Juul – DOR, Gerald Longton - DOR, Steve Ganoë - Marion, Dean Anderson Polk, Thomas Brateng - Polk, Dan Linscheid - Yamhill, Cress Bates – LCOG/Lane, Eric Brandt - LCOG, Dan Malaer – Washington

Facilitator: Scott Jackson

Agenda:

□ Goals 2-4 Clarification Subcommittee Report

Dean Anderson from Polk County distributed the sub-committee's draft report on how map accuracy and map development could relate to the ORMAP goals. The group took a considerable amount of time in discussion on this subject. Below are some of the important points of the conversation.

- The first step in relating the maps to the goals is to document map progress along with map accuracy.
- Need to tie goals 3 and 4 to something that can be summarized by all counties. That summary should be built from all the county maps, with testing for map accuracy. Document existing control points as the counties know how accurate their control points are and how tax lots relate to them. Estimates in rural areas can be more accurate than in urban areas.
- Method of reporting your control points need to exceed the amount of control points.
- For absolute accuracy it should meet national map accuracy standards.
- Do we need to identify on a map how good a map is? No, control points are present, accuracy documented and the map references the control points.
- You may have to estimate. Based on the cartographers knowledge of map construction information to grandfather your maps in.
- A good test would be a distance comparison.
- We should come up with more tests. We need to explain to entire group how you are testing. Tell us how many meet the accuracy or not and come up with a percentage of maps.
- Dan Malaer from Washington County reported the procedure they use to build their

maps, is like a test.

- If you have the control points identified and have used COGO, you should be able to verify your accuracy.
- Counties should have control on county lines. Still statewide questions when there is an error.
- If everyone uses the same process this should eliminate the statewide questions.
- A suggestion was made that we make it a requirement to establish common boundaries with your neighboring county before goal 3.
- Surveys that have newer than 1980 should have good information with control points.
- Tests have to be verifiable. With control points and someone looking at it must be able to follow the same documented control points and be able to come up with the same results you did. We also need to show how we are improving the maps.
- We should bring this up at the Cartographer's breakout at OSACA, ON THURSDAY.
- Everyone needs a strategic plan on where they are going and how they are going to get there.
- Every proposal should be able to state where they have improved with ORMAP funding.
- Set up a spreadsheet and come up with map list and tie with statewide section map. Identify polygon status. Additional columns to document your maps accuracy. Link as a graphic product to maps.
- Have spreadsheet developed by March 27th to pass out.

Action Item: Present to Cartographers at the Winter OSACA Conference and ask for input. "The committee is looking at a variety of alternatives for measuring accuracy, progress and reporting on it."

Talking points... any tool(s) used to measure accuracy must be:

1. Easily explained and understood.
2. Completed for each map in a reasonable amount of time.
3. Reproducible or easily verified.
4. Fits within the mapping requirements as defined by Department of Revenue.
5. Tied to our goals.
6. Easy to manage by county and state staff.

Bring cartographer input to the next tech group meeting and finalize alternative(s) for measuring accuracy, progress and reporting on it.

Future Agenda Item:

- Modifications to goal 3 and 4. Go over as a draft in next meeting in order to present to advisory committee.

- Goal 3, am I half way there? Eliminate reference in goal 3. Goal 3 is a step in the state wide process. To legislation, a benchmark... big picture.

□ Map Accuracy 8TH Attribute - Data Exchange Standard (page 12)

- The group had discussion on whether we need the 8th attribute.

Action Item: After some discussion the consensus of the Tech Group was to add an 8th, 9th and 10th required attributes. They are:

8. Source
9. Source ID
10. NAD 83 adjustment

Note: Dean Anderson will send “number of characters”

□ Unique Parcel Identifier

- This is very important, as it will be used in building statewide databases.
- State taxlot ID and can stick two digit county number for the statewide id. This is an issue that will be coming and it was agreed we do not want catenation problems.

□ ORMAP Allowances Mapping Components “Average Costs”

Time did not allow discussion of agenda topic. Tabled until the next regularly scheduled meeting set for February 27th.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.