

ORMAP Technical Group Meeting Minutes
 March 2, 2006
 Anne Basker Auditorium
 Grants Pass, Oregon

Members in attendance:

Phil McClellan, DOR	Brian Hansberry, Yamhill County	David Cutting, Lane County	Byron Clayton, BLM
Mike Schneyder, Josephine County	Bob Pinotti, Polk County	Cress Bates, Lane County	Brett Juul, DOR
Doug Sackinger, Benton County	Dean Anderson, Polk County	Thomas Brateng, Polk County	Keith Massie, Jackson County
John Prychun, DOR	Daniela Urbatzka, Lane County	Laurie Burke, Coos County	John McCafferty, Josephine County
Hall Guttormsen, IDS	Brian Mladenich, Lane County	Barbara Foord, Coos County	

Members via Conference Call:

Mark Kinslow, DOR	Jeri Sue Ponder, Clatsop County	Tracie Diehl, Umatilla County	Kerry Savage, Baker County
Eric Bohard, Clackamas County	Joe Flori, Columbia County		

The meeting was opened with introductions and thanks to Josephine County for providing the facilities for the meeting today.

Lane County:

Lane County is requesting \$67,000 in ORMAP funds to continue the funding of the GIS/Cartographer Technician position at Lane County A&T.

Dean Anderson asked what the difference was in the cost per taxlot on this grant opposed to the cost from the fall 2005 grant.

David Cutting/Cress Bates stated that the cost per taxlot for the fall 2005 grant was \$25/taxlot and the spring 2006 cost would be \$7.05/taxlot.

Keith Massie asked if the \$408K of total partnerships is for this grant only.

David stated that the partnerships were for this year in Lane County.

There were no other questions for Lane County concerning this grant application.

Coos County:

Coos County is requesting \$69,445 in ORMAP funds to begin Phase 3 or Project Area #1. This is a continuation of the spring 2005 grant which was cut by DOR.

Tom Brateng asked who was checking the control that has been collected.

Hall Guttormsen stated that they are mapping to the surveys collected points by GOGO'ing to those points.

Dean asked if they were checking that taxlot when that add the control and asked what the QC process would be since it was not described in the grant application.

Brett Juul stated that DOR staff will assist in a QC check of data for Coos County, but they will need to figure in money for DOR staff time.

Bob Pinotti stated that Grant Merrill said at an earlier Tech Group meeting the DOR would fund DOR staff time for QC.

Brett said that this did not work out completely because of staff turnover issues at the DOR.

Bob then asked if DOR could provide a short report on how DOR did the QC and why the things were done for the QC of Coos County's data.

Dean stated that he would like to see that report when DOR was finished.

Brett said that DOR will provide a report to the Tech Group on its findings of a past QC process.

Cress Bates asked if this would increase the amount that Coos County would be requesting.

Brett stated that it would increase their grant request. He was estimating that it would take about 100 hours of DOR staff time at about \$30/hour. But they will work with Coos County to better estimate the amount of time needed to QC the data.

Keith stated that Section III.A.3 on the ORMAP grant application (What is the status/outcome of previous ORMAP-funded projects?) needed to be updated; the timeline for Phase #2 June 2007 and Phase #3 March 2007.

David asked if the annotation would be there or not.

Hall said that IDS will create the annotation.

Addendum Item: Coos County will work with DOR to figure the additional cost for the DOR QC of their data. Then DOR will send out one of its past reports of its ORMAP Goal 4 QC findings.

Josephine County:

Josephine County is requesting \$61,750 in ORMAP funds to add annotation and symbology to the 6,500 taxlot polygons on the 85 taxmaps and convert to a geodatabase.

Mike Schneyder stated that Josephine County got the data for the City of Grants Pass for use as Goal 4 data and that DOR has reviewed the data. There are over 100 control points over the 9 mile area, with the greatest error being >1.5 feet within the city of Grants Pass while it is ± 100 feet in the resource areas. There is no annotation or ancillary line work on the data received from the city surveyor so the all that will need to be added to the data. A pilot was done on 2,080 taxlots within the City of Grants Pass and this grant is to complete an additional 6,500 taxlots.

Brett said that DOR when evaluating Josephine County the geodatabase would be similar the one in use at DOR. He went on to state that DOR has been experiencing some turnover in the Cartography Unit and this would be a good project for the new incoming cartographers.

Cress asked how this data compares with the DOR's Goal 4 data.

Brett said that it did well in the test area of the pilot project.

Mike added that the rest of the county was data created in 1992 from "Uni-Group"; the Grants Pass data has better accuracy. Also changes will be need to the city's data to remove undocumented subdivisions. The city has added planned/proposed subdivisions, but if they haven't been signed off by the Assessor's Office they will be removed from the data.

Keith asked since there were 1,900 taxlots completed last cycle will DOR (the contractor) be able to meet the 2/28/2007 deadline.

Brett said that should be no problem, which is why the project area was reduced down to 6,500 taxlots from the original 13,000.

There were no further questions.

Polk County:

Polk County is requesting \$30,000 in ORMAP funds to create approximately 1,500 Goal 4 taxlots in the area of NE Dallas.

Dean states that in light of new information the \$30,000 amount is inaccurate and that Polk County will need to add an additional \$10,000 for a total of \$40,000. Dean said he would submit a revised ORMAP Grant Application to reflect the changes needed. He then introduced the Polk County Pilot Study Review (handout); the Pilot was a spring 2005 ORMAP grant. (A copy of the Polk County Pilot Study Review will be available on the ORMAP site (add link) for review.) Dean stated that this process will not work in urban or rural areas outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

Hall asked what equipment was used for this study area.

Dean said he that they are working under the technical supervision of the Polk County Surveyor and will follow his recommended procedures.

Cress asked if the Goal 4 in the urban areas were trouble areas because the “old town” was using very old surveys and would Polk County be using a “best fit” in these areas.

Polk County described that they could only use the best available data and there may be no way to resolve those areas other than “best fit”.

Addendum Item: Polk County will provide detail for the additional \$10,000 needed and break down amount of work on Goal 4 mapping.

Yamhill County:

Yamhill County is requesting \$65,000 in ORMAP funds to continue their county remapping. The area addressed in the grant will be the taxlots surrounding the cities of Newberg, Dayton, and Lafayette.

Brian Hansberry stated that this is a continuation of Yamhill County’s spring 2005 ORMAP grant because the grant was cut by DOR. They will be finishing the area requested in the original spring grant. The control for this area is from earlier surveys of rural DLC and section corners.

Brett asked if DOR will be reviewing the data.

Brian said that some DOR review would be needed, but he was very comfortable with the review process and could do most of it at the county. He added that Yamhill County is currently building township tiles and that the current maps are to ORMAP Goal 2 but they are using that data to create Goal 4 maps.

Tom asked how many control points Yamhill County was using for their 2000 scale maps.

Brain said that there were no 2000 scale maps only 400 scale maps. This area is in the urban areas of Yamhill County. He added that this is an increased amount in order to keep the County’s 2008 date for Goal 4.

Bob asked Brett how this cost (\$13/taxlot) compared to DOR costs.

Brett stated that the cost differences between an urban taxlot vs. a rural taxlot were very close to DOR costs on urban and rural taxlots. (Since control for this project was collected in earlier ORMAP grants, that cost is not reflected in the per taxlot costs.)

There was also some question as to who or what this money was going to fund. It is stated in the grant that would fund (Section III.B.2). Is this for a 1 FTE or an increase of .5 FTE? Yamhill County will have to address this in an addendum.

Addendum Item: Please explain how the requested \$65,000 will fund staff. Is it a new 1 FTE position or an increase to the current .5 FTE to a 1 FTE?

Benton County:

Benton County is requesting \$60,000 in ORMAP funds for control points to continue the County's remapping effort.

Doug Sackinger stated that this is a continuation of Benton County's spring 2005 ORMAP grant application in which 1,200 points were collected to aid the remapping effort in the Corvallis area; this will be in the "old town" and UGB areas.

The questions from the group were the number of taxlots and taxmaps that Benton County would create with these control points. Also, if ORMAP is paying for the control how much is Benton County's dollar contribution to the creation of the taxlots and taxmaps. These will be addressed with an addendum.

Addendum Item: How many taxlots and taxmaps will be created with these control points? What is Benton County's contribution to the creation of the taxlots and taxmaps?

Umatilla County: (Tracie Diehl via phone)

Umatilla County is requesting \$32,600 in ORMAP funds to edge match Umatilla County to the surrounding counties. In addition, they are seeking funds for 2005 aerial photographs from the NAIP flight to aid in the location of rivers and canals in the county.

Dean asked if Tracie could explain the math for her request, in Section II.B (Cost of Total Project).

Tracie explained that the amounts for Edge Match to surrounding Counties (\$23,400), Map Rivers and Canals via Photo Analysis (\$7,800), and the 2005 Aerial photos of Umatilla County (\$5,000) would be covered by the ORMAP request. The remaining costs for the update changes to parcel fabric (\$48,600) and Control GeoCoded from surveys (\$68,860) would be covered by county partnerships and county funds.

Keith then asked why Umatilla County couldn't use the 2003 photos and how many taxlots are along the river and canals in the county. He then added that it seems like the 2005 photos are more of a maintenance item and they will be free within a few months.

Umatilla County said they would check into the date when these photos would be available for free from the State.

Keith then asked if the surrounding counties would be using your data when they edge match their own counties.

Tracie replied that "they should". She added that Umatilla County would make their data available to any of the neighboring counties to use during their edge match process.

Brett added that Grant County is completed and you could use their data if you need it.

Keith then asked if Umatilla County had an agreement with their surrounding counties concerning their boundaries. Keith continued by asking approximately how many taxlots are affected along the edge of the county.

Dean asked why DOR can't provide these photos; he then asked what the timing would be for these photos.

Keith added that we could contact Cy Smith, State GIS Coordinator, for more information about the 2005 photos and their availability. And it was his understanding that the 2005 photos are Mr. Sid compression.

Umatilla County said that they would check to with the State as to the availability of these photos and their format.

Coordinator update: I contacted Cy Smith on March 6, 2006 and he stated that the photos will be available to the counties by April 2006, but the portal for the free downloading the photos will not be set up until as late as the end of December 2006. If counties would like the photos sooner they can pay a fee of \$5,000. This fee is used to cover the cost of the portable hard drive that the photos are shipped on and to help the state recoup the cost of the photos and portal development. It would be suggested if you can wait until the state portal is up and running to do so. But if getting the data earlier will help counties to reach ORMAP Goal 4 sooner, it will take into consideration helping counties get the photos.

Baker County: (Kerry Savage via phone)

Baker County is requesting \$42,975 in ORMAP funds to complete the re-mapping, edge matching and conversion to countywide geodatabase. This would put Baker County at Goal 4 once the remaining 1,500 taxlots and 70 taxmaps were completed. The 1,500 taxlots would be completed at a cost of \$21.75/taxlot, and then the entire county would

be converted to a geodatabase. This would be a conversion of 69 townships (15,000 taxlots and 806 taxmaps) at a cost of \$150/township.

Bob asked what kind of control was being used for these taxlots and taxmaps. Also, we wanted to know if this was really 3 separate projects and they should be broken down as such:

1. Edge Matching County Townships
2. Edge Matching County Boundaries
3. Converting to Geodatabase

Kerry/Brett said they will be using the current GCDB for the 1,500 taxlots in the rural areas. But as far as breaking the project down into three separate pieces would be wrong; this because by putting the data into a geodatabase helps in the edge matching of the county township boundaries. And when a non Goal 4 township along the county line is being rebuilt the county edge match is just a result of that process.

Keith wanted to know when Baker County completes this project will they be to Goal 4. If so, could they state this in the grant application?

Brett replied that Baker County would be to Goal 4 upon the completion of this project and they could add that to an addendum item.

Addendum Item: Add a statement to the grant application to the fact that Baker County will be to Goal 4 upon completion of this project.

Clackamas County: (Eric Bohard via phone)

Clackamas County is requesting \$30,000 in ORMAP funds for the conversion of plats and surveys using GOGO techniques around the Damascus area (\$25,000). Also, to provide funding for testing and development of the ESRI integrated map production tools (\$5,000).

A discussion began regarding the ESRI Parcel Modeling Tool Group and how to fund the projects that members of the group do, such as tool building. And how to apply for grants from ORMAP, should each member work individually or should they somehow apply as a group?

Phil stated that he didn't care how the group decided to ask for funding, if they wanted to work together as the "37th County" in Oregon or if they wanted to work as individuals. He just wanted to make sure that they were coordinating their efforts and not duplicating work that other counties are doing. Phil brought up the example of the grant that Jackson County applied for to have ERSI teach three classes around the state on how to use the tool.

The group then discussed the difficulties of one county being the steward of the group and how to handle the billing. It made sense that one person be coordinating the efforts, but impractical in attempts to bill for work being done. If County A was the Steward, and County B and C did work, would they have to bill County A then have County A bill ORMAP? All agreed that that would not be a good way of doing it. The suggestion of the “37th County” seemed to be a good idea but some remember this question being asked of DOR in the past but it wasn’t possible.

Dean, Keith and Eric asked to work together on an addendum item to coordinate the efforts of the ESRI Parcel Model Tool Group and would submit a revision to ORMAP by the Mach 9th Addendum deadline.

Phil said that he would check with the Contracting Officer at DOR when he returned.

Addendum Item: Members of the ERSI Parcel Modeling Group will work to decide how the \$5,000 would best be used for the group.

Coordinator Update: When I returned to DOR I check to see about the use of a “37th County” for the parcel modeling effort. I was told that multiple counties could use the same ISA (contract number), but each of those counties needed to be named and sign the agreement. The group would have to outline who was going to what tasks and how much each of those tasks would cost. Then a “not to exceed” statement would be placed in the contract for the participating counties. If the group were to decide after the contract was in place to reallocate funds to different counties for their efforts, and amendment to the contract could be made, but all the named counties would have to sign the amendment.

Columbia County: (Joe Flori via phone)

Columbia County is requesting \$94,840 to fund the 6th of the 9 scheduled phases designed to meet Goal 2. This request includes the conversion of 3,212 taxlots (130 taxmaps) to Goal 4. This will require 267 additional control points (\$300/pt.) and 225 hours for QC (\$47/hr.). Columbia County was able to find partnerships with the Columbia River Fire & Rescue, Columbia County Surveyor, and the City of Rainier in the amount of \$49,500 for the collection of 165 of the 267 control points requested. Also, that Columbia County would be paying for the staff time needed to QC the work (\$10,575).

Note: Joe Flori’s connection on the phone was very poor so he OK’d Dean Anderson to continue on Columbia County’s behalf.

Phil wanted to note that many will notice that Columbia County has by far the largest outstanding balance of ORMAP funds, over \$290K. But as stated in Columbia County’s grant application Section III.A.3 (Status/outcome of pervious ORMAP-funded projects) two previous ORMAP grants are still in the works with an outside contractor (~\$190K). The contractor has yet to bill for any of the work and has been assuring Columbia County that all the work will be completed by the contract deadlines of June 30, 2006. In the

meantime Columbia County has decided to move in a different direction by hiring a new contractor to work in house at Columbia County and these new funds (fall 2005 and this spring 2006) are to fund the new in house contracted work.

Joe added that it is working out much better having the contractor working there at Columbia County.

It was asked who Columbia County had used for its older contracts.

Joe answered that ESU had been contracted in the past by Columbia County, but they were now using a different contractor.

There were not further questions for Columbia County.

Phil then talked about agenda items for the 2nd Tech Group Meeting on March 23rd; he had listed a couple on the current agenda. The agenda items that he thought might be good to talk about on at the 2nd meeting were;

1. A review of the Oregon Digital Cadastral Exchange Standard version 1.1. Phil added that this was the first run at a Goal 2 deliverable using this new standard and thought it would be good to review it. There is a standards forum in June down in Eugene and DOR would like to present some suggested changes to help improve the document. And since many of the counties, but not all, have submitted their goal 2 it would be good to hear what people liked and disliked about it. And if they had any suggestions.
2. A taxlot count for each county. Phil said that they at DOR were trying to get a better idea of how many taxlots were completed to Goal 4. The current business plans only have the number of taxmaps to Goal 4. The number of taxmaps can be a little misleading since there could be 5 taxlots on a taxmap or 100. A county could have 80% of their taxmaps done, but if those are all rural taxmaps with very few taxlots, say only 60% of a counties taxlots, they would not truly be 80% to Goal 4. So, if it was possible Phil would like for the counties to provide a count of actual taxlot polygons completed to Goal 4.
3. The ORMAP Online Business Plans. Phil would like to talk about the online ORMAP business plans and how they are used both for the counties and for his coordination of the project. There is a lot of information that is on those business plans that are used for percent complete and for projecting how much money will be need to fund future ORMAP projects, Phil said. He just wants to make sure everyone understand the importance of those business plans.
4. DOR Goal 4 QC. It was suggested that Brett's group at DOR talk about what is involved in the QC process at DOR for determination of a Goal 4 maps.

End of Meeting:

Phil wanted to thank everyone who made the trip down to Grants Pass for this meeting and the input that they gave. And he wanted to remind those counties that had addendum items that he would send out those questions to them and they needed to have their responses to him no later than Thursday March 9th. And that the 2nd Tech Group Meeting would be on Thursday March 23rd from 10 am – 3pm at the Salem Field Office AND that word has it that the noisy server has been removed from that room!