

ORMAP Technical Group Minutes  
 Fall 2005 Cycle – 2<sup>nd</sup> Tech Group Meeting  
 Department of Revenue – Salem Field Office  
 March 23, 2006

*In Attendance:*

Phil McClellan	DOR	Andrea Westersund	Multnomah County
Tom Martin	Multnomah County	John Prychun	DOR
Bob Pinotti	Polk County	Dean Anderson	Polk County
David Barbour	Tillamook County	Wendy Schink	Tillamook County
JeriSue Ponder	Clatsop County	Thomas Brateng	Polk County
Hall Guttormsen	IDS	Byson Clayton	BLM
Steve Ganoe	Marion County	Brian Hansberry	Yamhill
Brett Juul	DOR	John Waffenschmidt	Lincoln County
Eric Bohard	Clackamas County	Roger Livingston	Washington County
Doug Sackinger	Benton County	Cress Bates	Lane County

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. The March 2, 2006 Tech Group minutes were approved.
3. Addendum Review:

**Baker** – Kerry Savage

Upon completion of the grant they will be to goal 4.

**Benton** - Doug

Tax lots created in Benton County are 4,471. They are contributing \$53,912 to the ORMAP project which will be two FTE.

**ESRI Parcel Model** – Dean Anderson

Parcel modeling tool: There are six counties that have approval for the parcel modeling tool. This is outside of the budget. We wrote a process by which we could have a report. The county could go out to a contractor upon approval by the user group. This will demonstrate to the ORMAP group that the job is complete. The concept is to pool program resources. Sharing tools will benefit everyone in the state. Software on an open software development site is available. A map production tool is the next step and should be done before July. Dean will forward Phil a copy of the email. Before we spend any funds the deliverable will be planned out by the group and an estimate will be submitted.

Macros: Dean described an example of a macro that they want to have. Applications go into new data structure. The new tools give us a lot faster way of remapping.

ESRI identified a list of better tools needed beyond the baseline tools. Four counties are currently in the beta program. Every county has that option. As we move into these new tools and mapping we will identify what the real costs are to do this.

**Polk** – Dean Anderson

After the original proposal was submitted it was identified that they were short \$10,000. The estimates to obtain skilled personnel will run higher than initially thought. The cost to Polk is \$55,000 instead of \$45,000.

**Coos** – Barbara Foord

Additional funds were requested to finance some review time to quality check goal 4 work. Brett said that 100 hours would cover the expense. An extra \$3000 would cover the DOR assistance.

**Umatilla** – Tracie Diehl

The services of an aerial photographer would be obtained with their grant request. They should have their portal open by the end of the year to make the images available. With \$5,000 they can reach goal 4 earlier. The State has photos but no way of providing them to the counties outside of an external provider. The target date to have the portal ready to download would be the end of this year. The \$5,000.00 requested now would get the information to them now instead of waiting for it.

*Comments:*

- Suggestion: Let DOR get it from DAS and then give to counties and complete Umatilla's work at the same time.
- John Prychun: We need to follow-up with DAS and see where they are at. We don't have a capacity to store all of the data. Does DAS? We need to see the size and scope of what is going on before we move forward.
- Phil: The main issue is that data is available but there is no way of distributing it. It will be on an external hard drive. For Tracie's needs she could have the imagery by April and ability to use it.
- Phil: Affected would be 2,270 tax lots along rivers and canals and around 2,000 county boundaries.
- What assurances are there that everyone will use the same data for edgematching?
- Nothing formal has been put in place as far as counties signing off.
- Phil: Emails will be used as a form of tracking. When something has been edgematched, it should not be requested again. Commissioners would feel free to sign off on projects more easily if we had a more formal process in place. Once there is an agreement, it will not be set in stone. As new information comes, things will change. Right now we will rely on email.
- Brett: We have acknowledged that for valley counties it will be much more difficult. We are in the initial stages of hammering something out. Use of GPS and control points can be used to identify outside boundaries. GCS is not within the accuracy standards that we are looking for. Topic and discussions for future meetings will need to center on edge matching.
- Phil: Once new information comes to light everyone will need to be kept updated. Eventually we will take the possibility of a goal 5 to the advisory committee. Some counties are scheduled to meet the 2008 date while others are not. We will need to determine whether we should wait until the entire state is at goal 4 or let some counties move forward.
- Brett: Fewer and fewer counties are asking for ORMAP dollars. Theoretically, only goal 4 projects were to be funded.
- Brett: Clarification on Umatilla. If CSEPP funds are put into jeopardy because they're not able to get photos for free. Should we give Umatilla the money? What kind of guarantee

will we have that they would be able to get the photos in time to use CSEPP funds? Cy is still waiting to get them from the contractor. By the end of the year photos will be free.

- Asked if they were contractually obligated, Tracie replied that they were not.

**Yamhill** – Brian Hansberry

The grant request of \$65,000 will fund a full time position.

#### 4. **Countywide Goal 4 Taxlot Count** – Phil

Phil requested that each county send him an email with an estimate of how many taxlots have been completed to goal 4 standards.

Some members shared that it will be impossible to bring some areas, (especially old town areas) up to goal 4 standards. It would be good to report goal 4 exception areas and there be some documentation of these areas.

In answer to the question, “To make a goal 4 taxlot do you need a goal 4 map first? Can you ignore edge matching and still get goal 4 tax lots”? Brett replied that a Goal 4 map needs to have all the tax lots in it done to Goal 4 specs. Once a county says that tax lots are at goal 4 it is a possible indication that there is no longer any need for funding.

Phil said that if a county has completed a tax map to goal 4, he would like to know how many tax lots are in those maps that are at goal 4 standards.

In the discussion it was stated that there are goal 4 taxlots that are not in a goal 4 map. Phil said that he would discuss exactly what numbers are needed after he receives input from Mark Kinslow.

#### 5. **Review of the Oregon Digital Cadastral Exchange Standard** – Rod Therriault

There are now more than 1.7 million polygons in the state. Counties had difficulty with two of the fields that were to be filled in. The special interest field needs a change in the standard from Boolean to a single character. “Integer” needs to be replaced with “long integer” in tax lot feet. In all fields if there is a null value, at least a “0” should be entered. In some cases he received data was not checked before being submitted.

Some of Rod’s suggestions, insights:

- Use the correct county number
- Counties with rivers for boundaries: He would like to see a cooperative effort to use the same boundary.
- Would it be helpful to send each county their shape file with a quarter mile clipping around so they can start looking at the problem areas?
- Data needs to look good. It doesn’t take long to check your work. Rod spent a lot of time sanitizing the data that he received.
- You can extract your data and see what your goal 4 data should look like.
- Projections: One standard projection is needed. Rod would find it very helpful if the shape files came to him re-projected to OLP.
- Rod would like to see the data exchange standard whole.
- Rod had to repair geometry and build grids in order for him to get some data into a shape file.

*ACTION:* Now that one statewide taxlot polygon is done, Dean suggested that Phil make a wall map to demonstrate this for the next ORMAP advisory meeting.

*Comments:*

- John Prychun asked if there is anything that people had trouble with. Does language need to be modified to make it more understandable?
- Cress: They had trouble with township/range number. Rod caught it and sent it back with that comment.
- Andrea: Could Rod go back and look at the errors and give feed back.

- Rod: There is not time for him to do that.
- Dean: Lessons learned coming from all the counties would help for the next time around. Some of the issues need to be addressed so the same problems won't occur again.

## 6. Online ORMAP Business Plans – Phil McClellan

Phil uses the on-line county business plans to project into the future. They are helpful when grants are submitted and keep him informed of how many tax maps are completed to goal 4. The business plan is important to identify exceptions, partnerships and changes. Goals that were set years ago are reprioritized as needed and helps Phil to see if goals are being followed through. The current format makes it easy to update. The business plans will be moved from the Jackson County site to the ORMAP site.

### *Comments:*

- Andrea: The information on-line is brief. We need more space for important data. Do we need to revise our goals to achieve something more realistic?
- Phil: We would like a realistic picture to present to the advisory committee. The 2008 date was pulled out of the air. We need to effectively explain that to the advisory committee.
- Tom Martin: Define edge matching. How detailed, what is the cost, and what are the benefits without mentioning control. What is the goal and purpose of ORMAP? Is getting rid of slivers and gaps a part of that goal?
- Brett: Yes it is. The purpose of ORMAP is to have a seamless map statewide for many different business purposes.
- Dean: It would be a good idea to have the ability to have attachments put into the business plan. This would give folks opportunity to have a better understanding.
- Counties need to have something that annually tracks their progress. A progress report would give DOR an indication that the plan was looked at.
- Phil: A county page could be placed on the website for PDF files that contain additional information.
- No one is interested in doing the historical type of business plan. On-line is more successful.
- Multnomah has 3,350 maps and 2,400 scale maps and are not edge matched to each other. They have four cartographers.
- John Waffenschmidt – Goal 4 is an attainable thing.
- Tom Martin – Goal 4 is not attainable for Multnomah County according to present standards.
- John W – There is no choice but to move toward goal 4.
- Multnomah County's concerns need to be presented to the advisory committee
- If we want to incorporate exceptions, a proposal should be presented to the advisory committee. Exceptionaries are a possible solution.
- Phil: Problems and possible solutions need to be presented to the advisory group.
- Dean: Adding exceptions to the business plan gives us the ability to gather data from all the counties. This gives a comprehensive look in the context of the entire state.
- Phil: May 4 is the advisory meeting. Please send him information on this issue to present to the advisory committee.
- Andrea: There is a point we stopped remapping long ago because accuracy was good enough. We will never get done. Multnomah County had control to begin with. It would become chaos if we moved everything. You're going to get what you're going to get because it is good enough for us.
- John Waffenschmidt: Multnomah County needs to take that argument to the advisory committee.
- Andrea: What does matching mean. Most of our error is within a foot. If it is within that is it considered edgematched?
- Brett: Gaps and overlaps need to be eliminated or documented as unresolved.

- Phil: On-line business plans need to be extended. Counties can send attachments/PDF documents and these can be put on a page on the ORMAP site. Also within the business plans or attachments, areas can be identified that are troublesome. Counties can go to the advisory committee to address the troublesome issues. Documentation of these areas will help everyone know about this.
- Cress Bates: What we are trying to do today is assign exceptions to those areas that we cannot assign a reliability code.

**ACTION:** Phil would like a summary from the group that he could take to the advisory committee.

## **7. DOR Goal 4 QC (quality control) process – Brett**

Brett gave an explanation of the table of quality control check-offs that he and his staff have been working on.

- Line Work accuracy and geometry.
  - ◆ 10 lines distributed across the map with COGO characteristics.
  - ◆ Would goal 4 accuracy be affected?
  - ◆ Look for percentages that element geometry could be off.
  - ◆ Does every line check have to be within that tolerance – maybe, maybe not?
  - ◆ County cartographers/surveyors will be the best authority of what’s out there and why.
- The table will give you a consistent mapping of goal 4 standards.
- Highway right of ways (Dean: issue with county roads is that seldom you get an “as-built”)
- Brett: Roads/width of them / errors might have been hidden there
- Evaluation process will assist you as you go through the steps. If you find evidence of inaccuracies you may not have a goal 4 map.
- Check list / Spreadsheet:
- Accuracy / geometry
- Accuracy of location
- Method of mapping / ties to corner
- Feature area: Specific size.
- Edgematching – gaps and overlaps are eliminated or documented as irresolvable.
- Maps need to be contiguous.
- Assessor’s map test – conformity to the map manual.
- Digital Cadastral data content
- Oregon Cadastral data content standard
- Type and amount of control points used, if any.
- Percentage of map features etc.
- Numbers of lines tested for accuracy; less than 2% length error
- What is the type and quality of the ortho photo;
- Kind of alignment between the ortho photo and the map features
- Error percentage for scale
- Edgematched
- Hard copy produce-able
- Meets cadastral map standard?
- Data meets the ORMAP data content standard?

**ACTION:** Brett will send out the evaluation sheet to be used in a Goal 4 map evaluation and suggestions for improvement to the sheet can be sent back to him.

*Comments:*

Andrea: What is the timeframe this takes per map?

Brett: It takes approximately 2-3 hours for 10 maps. This was taking areas of the maps that looked good.

Dean: This could be a consistent way of evaluation. He would like to start with this and have a sample of tests that the group can collectively look at to find out if it is a useful way of identifying goal 4 maps.

Brett: This is a rough draft – The group can add things as they see fit.

Bob: This would add consistency in checking maps.

Dean: We need to have a clean process of determining goal 4 maps. This could be tested out in some limited areas. It would also add to the consistency of goal 4 maps among counties.

Bob: What about an ORMAP FTE that would just check maps?

Andrea: It would take an estimated 3 hours per map for us to do this. We can not give more time.

Brett: We propose using a sampling of maps. We can change and improve on the spreadsheet.

*ACTION:* Brett will send out the spreadsheet. Please look at it and send him your comments.

Dean: With something like this checklist, we will be more equipped to defend the progress we have made in 2008.

## 8. Miscellaneous

- Licensing Agreements for Goal 2:

DAS has decided to abandon the sharing agreement. Some counties have already signed the agreement and until further notice, they can continue with those agreements.

DOR is looking for an informal agreement that the counties will be comfortable with. We have an informal agreement that is in use on the ORMAP site for searching tax lots. Phil can send out an email of how they will use county goal 2 data.

- Grants:

We have received about half of the grants that were expected for this cycle. Seven counties didn't ask for funds that had originally planned to do so. Some reasons included staffing problems, outstanding funds that had not been used and business plans that had been re-worked to change guidelines.

*ACTION:* Phil will contact counties by phone that plan on requesting funding for the fall '06 cycle.

- Goal 5: Eventually we will ask for ideas of what the group believes goal 5 should be.

This subject will be tabled until further notice.

- Review of the cadastral exchange standard: The FIT (Framework Implementation Team) will need to plan a full day meeting in the near future.

Next advisory committee meeting: May 4, 2006; 10 AM – 3 PM; Salem Field Office.

Items to address:

1. A definitive statement of the goal 4 in 2008 is not realistic.
2. Exception data
3. Andrea: Lowering of the expectations of goal 4 data.

*ACTION:* Send Phil an email before April 11 if there are other items that you want to address at the advisory meeting.

Adjourned 2:44 PM