

ORMAP TECH GROUP MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
August 31, 2006
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
DOR Salem Field Office

Present: Dale Aasted, Zane Adams, Dave Barbour, Cress Bates, Tom Brateng, Byron Clayton, Gail Ewart, Hall Guttormsen, Bruce Fichtman, Joe Flori, Steve Ganoë, Marcus Glass, Bob Haas, Brian Hansberry, Sally Hood, Brett Juul, Mark Kinslow, Roger Livingston, Phil McClellan, Brian Mladenich, Bob Pinotti, Jeri Sue Ponder, John Prychun, Wendy Schink, Ed Sipp, Rod Therriault

Phone: Eric Bohard, Laurie Burke, Sim Ogle, Janice Patterson, Andrea Westersund

Facilitator: Phil McClellan

Scribe: Sally Hood

Lane County – Cress Bates

Summary: Conversion to ARC GIS (Completion Date of 12/2010) using the ESRI Parcel Data Model. This would create A&T data elements of annotation, cartographic lines, water features, lot lines, and reference lines. The grant would fund 400 maps; Lane Public Works will produce 300 and Lane A&T will produce the final maps and QC them.

Question: There are already three outstanding grants in place. Why are more funds being requested? Why not just ask for an extension on the remaining funds?

Response: Of the three outstanding grants, \$30,000 of the \$60,925 grant has been returned to ORMAP; \$70,000 will be finalized and billed by November 2006; \$50,000 of the \$67,000 grant will be billed out by April 2007. The business plan details how many maps will be produced per year by A&T and Public Works.

Question: Once a grant is awarded, isn't the county obligated to fulfill it?

Response: As soon as a county realizes there is going to be a problem, it is best to stop at that point and talk to Phil. The deliverables can be negotiated, the contract can be extended or some other alternative can be looked at. It is not automatic; there must be an acceptable reason to grant an exception. Some examples are an increase in the rate of the cost of the deliverable, loss of staff, etc.

Question: Can you elaborate on the partnership contribution?

Response: The contributions are funded on our fiscal year. They are project specific rather than grant specific.

Coos County – Laurie Burke, Hall Guttormsen and Ed Sipp

Summary: This is a continuation of the conversion. This will begin Phase 4. Phase 1 is completed, and Phase 2 is in progress. The Project Area 2 includes the cities of North Bend and Coos Bay. The urban areas will be done first because of the possibility of growth.

Questions: The residual of Phase 1 was noted when it appears that should really be Phase 2.

It is confusing to track project areas and phases.

Response: Laurie will clean up the numbers and clarify project areas and phases. The updated application will be sent to DOR and posted to the ORMAP site.

Question: What are you using for control?

Response: The surveyor is providing 751 control points for Coos and North Bend. NGS points are available for roads, railroads, etc.

Curry County – Zane Adams

Summary: This will be the completion of the remapping of the Port Orford Area, and the collection of control points. Curry will contract with DOR for Quality Assurance on the maps.

Question: Which deliverable number is correct ~ the front page or page 3?

Response: Will clarify and send the updated version to DOR to be posted on the ORMAP site.

Question: The bid price on the points is for \$500. Are those current prices? Is there a possibility to re-bid for a better price?

Response: Will look into that and add it to the updated version.

Question: How does the 50/50 cost share split work with DOR?

Answer: Brett clarified that it doesn't exist. After researching it with the budget officer and others at DOR it was determined that it was more accurate to charge actual costs (currently \$30 per hour).

Question: The project timeline has a single milestone: control points. Could that be expanded on?

Response: Curry County will clarify and provide information in updated version.

Crook County – Sim Ogle

Summary: Crook is a maintenance county with DOR. Due to employee turnover issues at DOR the start of the original Phase 1 project was delayed. During that time there was an increase in mapping costs and DOR would not have sufficient funding for 744 of the taxlots in the original contract. The Phase 1 remapping area also experienced unusually high growth over the last two years so there are an additional 699 taxlots to be done. Since this re-mapping project has not started this restructure was done. This proposal will put the original phase 1 project on stable financial footing. No additional control is needed because it has already been completed.

Question: Could the deliverable be more specific and include the number of taxlots and the cost?

Response: See Section 3, Part B. (1,443 taxlots at \$23.10/taxlot).

Question: The answer to Section III, Part B #4 is unclear.

Response: (from the committee): This can be looked at later. DOR will look to reword the question (Section III, Part B Number 4) for future ORMAP grants.

Question: How was the original grant modified?

Response: The deliverables were restructured based on the new rate. There is more information in Section III, Part A #3.

Deschutes County – Bob Haas

Summary: The focus of this grant is to remap Deschutes County areas in the Cloverdale/Sisters area and in rural areas outside Redmond. The goal is to have 55 Goal 4 compliant tax maps in the La Pine area. The surveyor has donated control points, and the county cartographer is responsible for quality control.

Question: Are there more detailed completion dates available?

Response: That information is detailed in the business plan.

Klamath County – Bruce Fichtman

Summary: Klamath is converting to an ESRI based system. This grant will fund the mapping of townships that already have control points: Phase 1A. The cost for Goal 4 compliant maps is \$14 per taxlot.

Question: Your completion date is for March 1, 2007. Why not make that the end of the contract, October 1, 2007?

Response: Change the date.

Clatsop County – Jeri Sue Ponder

Summary: This grant is to complete the remapping of the water boundaries of 4 rural townships. This will be done using aerial photos. With this project complete, all Clatsop County taxlots will be Goal 4. The last step is the annotation.

Comment: Due to a staffing issue the completion date will need to be changed to October 2007.

Tillamook County – Wendy Schink & Dave Barbour

Summary: This is the third year of a three year project converting maps to GIS. This will provide supplemental funding for a cartographer; currently the position is funded at 60% so this will provide an additional 40%. The project will start in February with the first deliverables produced in January 2007. Previous grants have been completed but have not been billed to ORMAP.

Question: How do you track the 60% vs. 40%?

Response: It varies depending on workload but it's tracked.

Clackamas County – Eric Bohard

Summary: The fund request will provide an ArcGIS license dedicated to the assessor's group who COGO the maps. The balance of the funds will be used to convert taxlots in rural areas. An outstanding grant of \$40,000 to taxlot Damascus has recently been awarded and the contract has been extended.

Question: Section III, Part B, #3 looks like old language. Perhaps it was a cut and paste and needs to be updated? Is it compliant with the most recent version of the data standards?

Response: This will be looked at.

Question: Is this the most current of the grant document?

Response: The grant will be rewritten using the most current version of the application.

Multnomah County – Andrea Westersund & Janice Patterson

Summary: This is a continuation of the original plan to preserve the integrity of the CAD data and migrate to a seamless GIS database. The rural areas are about 50% complete, but they represent only 3% of the taxlots. \$50,000 of the grant goes to fund cartography overtime, and \$30,000 goes to support maintenance and line work for plotting.

Question: Why is the contract written to fund overtime? The contract should be written to reflect the number of taxlots completed rather than the number of hours it took to complete them. Details about the grant should be included in the grant application. Each grant should stand alone when reviewed.

Response: This grant is written in the same format as previous grants. Phil will advise Andrea regarding this.

Question: What plotting tools are you looking at? Is it anything that can be shared with other users?

Response: Multnomah uses an Oracle Data Base.

Columbia County – Joe Flori & Dale Aasted

Summary: This grant of \$46,780 will allow Columbia County to complete Phase 7 including converting 837 taxlots, producing 44 tax lot maps, secure 70 control points, purchase ESRI SDE Workgroup license, and provide tech support and training for integrating Arc 9.2 and Geodatabase.

Question: Will the outstanding funds be requested prior to this grant cycle?

Response: Phase 5B should be done by November, and Phase 6 started in November.

Question: Could Phil explain why there are so many outstanding grants in general?

Response: Some counties bill monthly, but many counties wait until the project is completed and then bill. With Columbia County using an outside contractor that is delivering a completed phase, they are waiting until the entire phase has gone through the QC process before billing.

Question: Is training a covered expense?

Response: The group discussed DOR coordinating training that could be available for everyone and funded through ORMAP. Perhaps if a county is setting up a training session for their staff, someone from another county could participate.

This concluded the Grant Application Proposal reviews.

Other Business

Conversation regarding ARC SDE Workgroup

This software is half the price of ARC SDE. It is appropriate for smaller shops; it can support three licenses. Should ORMAP add it to the approved software list? GeoMedia products are already approved items on the list. If it is added it makes it easier to approve a grant request for the product. It was agreed that a \$5,000 allowance can be requested for any SDE product.

Additions to the New Attribute Fields for ORMAP Goal 4 Document.

The ReliaCode as it is written is unique to Oregon. Should it be changed to reflect more common standards?

Discussion: Gail suggested that it be defined to calibrate what the type of control translates to. A suggestion was made for the counties to write a description of how the ReliaCode relates to the numbers. The type of control affects what ReliaCode is used. Gail suggested a few different scenarios be put together and given to several counties to apply a ReliaCode. This will test the consistency of the use of the ReliaCode. Phil could coordinate that.

Brett gave an overview of why the ReliaCode was being implemented. ORMAP cannot make survey grade maps. The ReliaCode lets any user know how accurate the map is, and gives maintenance staff an idea of how much work it will take to maintain the maps. It must be simple and fast, but not compromise liability.

The ReliaCode must be consistent in its interpretation.

Gail: To make the code meaningful there must be some sense of translation.

Jeri Sue: use the Goal 4 standards when assigning the code.

Cress: let's look at a couple of scenarios and compare how the code was assigned.

Volunteers for this project:

- Jeri Sue Ponder/Clatsop County
- Cress Bates/Lane County
- Bob Pinotti/Polk County
- DOR

Should a recommendation regarding this be taken to the advisory committee?

Andrea asked what the importance of the ReliaCode is to the end user. Gail suggested the Tech member ask their users.

Meeting adjourned 3:00 pm