

## ORMAP TECH GROUP MEETING

### MEETING MINUTES

August 15, 2006

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

DOR Salem Field Office

**Present:** Dean Anderson, Cress Bates, Steve Barnett, Chris Bonn, Scott Branchfield, Laurie Burke, Gail Ewart, Toni Fisher, Steve Gano, Brian Hansberry, Bob Haas, Sally Hood, Brett Juul, Mark Kinslow, George Kirkeby, Wendell Lewis, Roger Livingston, Bob Mayer, Phil McClellan, Bob Pinotti, Jeri Sue Ponder, John Prychun, Kerry Savage, Rod Therriault, Kathy Thompson, Jesse Wayman, Andrea Westersund, Eileen Ystad

**Facilitator:** Phil McClellan

**Scribe:** Sally Hood

**Gail Ewart** from the Oregon Geospatial Enterprise Office (GEO) opened the meeting to talk about the Cadastral Framework. The ORMAP program's tax lots are just one of several elements in the Cadastral Framework, including Public Land Ownership and PLSS. Brett Juul has been serving as the Cadastral Framework lead and doing an admirable job, but he's ready for a rest.

Increased organization is needed to make sure all the Cadastral data will be integrated vertically and horizontally. Gail will act temporarily as the Cadastral Framework lead while initiating other Cadastral data development efforts. The Cadastral Framework Team will benefit from a person providing a link between tax lots and the rest of the elements in the Cadastral Framework and between Framework and ORMAP. Cress Bates, of Lane County Public Works, has agreed to be the tax lot work group leader. As someone working for local government, Cress has a fundamental and comprehensive understanding of the business purposes the data must support and his perspective is welcome to the FIT.

Mark added that the FIT has developed (and updated) a data exchange standard and as we move forward in defining the next steps, having a local government person chairing the committee (representing both the developers and users of the data), should help in this effort.

#### **Goal 4 Maps**

Mark Kinslow started a discussion about meeting Goal 4 standards. Are the accuracy quantifiers/targets just recommendations? When does a map meet Goal 4 standards? Are the standards and specifications realistic?

Would assigning reliability codes to the maps define whether or not the Goal 4 standard has been met? The handout “Accuracy and Reliability Codes for ORMAP Goal 4” shows a sample code used by the BLM:

Code	Control Reliability
01	1 foot or less
02	3 feet or less
03	10 feet or less
04	40 feet or less
05	100 feet or less
06	Greater that 100 feet

Andrea pointed out that there is a National Standard already in place for GIS mapping. The link to that is:

<http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/FGDC-standards-projects/accuracy/part3/chapter3>

Gail announced the FIT Forum in December will have a trainer to explain this system.

A discussion followed on how to get meaningful data for all users. Some questions were brought up:

- Does the framework need to be documented to accurately assess and report?
- What legal documents and control points are used?
- How can the counties measure data?
- How is accuracy measured?

John reminded the group that two years ago when the Advisory Committee was approached with a proposal to change Goal 4 standards, the request was denied. The suggestion was made that perhaps it is time to submit recommendations to redefine Goal 4 since we are that much closer to the 2008 deadline.

After much discussion and work, a matrix for assigning reliability codes was defined. The final product is a result of Phil working with the tech group after the meeting through email.

MapClass*	Goal4	ReliaCode
U = Urban	A = Meets or Exceeds Goal 4	01 -- ±2' 02 -- ±4'
R = Rural	B = Goal 4 not met	03 -- ±8' 04 -- ±20'
F = Farm/Forest (resource lands)	C = Does not meet Goal 4, but meets County A&T needs (exception area)	05 -- ±40' 06 -- >40' 00 -- Undetermined

To define the codes the questions were raised:

- Does the code apply to points, lines, or polygons?
- Would an average of all the control points for the map be calculated, and all taxlots on the map would fall within the codes?
- Would all the control points have a stated accuracy and the worst point would be the code?
- Would a subset of the taxlot fabric be calculated and acceptable if there was 80% accuracy? Would this test use lines and control points for existing maps, and control points for remapping projects? Would this all be identified in the methodology?

The professional judgment of the county cartographer would be the final say.

The Tech Group will request that the two new fields be added to the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard and the ESRI Geodatamodel.

The goal of using accuracy codes should eliminate the need to define exception areas.

These new fields, *MapClass\** and *Goal4*, will need to be added to the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard for the 2007 delivery of the *Goal 2+* data. As well, as defining the *ReliaCode* field. (*Goal 2+* data is a hybrid map of the Goal 2 data with little or no control and the Goal 4 data that is being developed in within the counties.)

*\* It was suggested that "LandUse" be changed to "MapClass" since LandUse is commonly used by other GIS layers.*

### **Delivery Dates**

Steve Ganoë suggested that county edge-matching be the goal for the Goal 4 deadline.

The data submitted in January 2007 will have the Control Reliability Codes and that will allow an accurate look at what percent will meet the Goal 4 Standards.

## **Goal 5**

The Advisory Committee has asked the ORMAP Tech Group to make suggestions for Goal 5. The Tech Group felt that all the counties should be within reach of completion of Goal 4 before deciding what Goal 5 should be. There was a consensus that when Goal 5 was discussed, those projects would be defined as; "Projects that facilitate and improve the administration of the ad valorem property tax system (*OAR 150-306.135*).” And to make it a broad category so that all the counties can participate; doesn't limit it, for example:

1. Development or improvement of soils maps
2. Development or improvement of other taxing layers that assist in property tax assessment (i.e. school districts, fire districts, etc.)
3. Mapping of building footprints

A comment was also made to have everyone finish up Goal 4 before the group moves on to Goal 5.

## **Questions for ORMAP**

Andrea mentioned that ORMAP does not always have the most current version of a map that is available. Would there be some way to link to the county directly so that the user would have the most up to date information?

## **Fall 2006 Grant Funds**

Phil explained that there is about \$568,000 in requests for fall 2006 grants. There should be about \$600,000 available to fund those requests.

Mtg Adjourned at 2:30 pm