

ORMAP TECH GROUP MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
September 21, 2006
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
Chemeketa Community College

Present: Dean Anderson, Dave Barbour, Cress Bates, Eric Bohard, Tom Brateng, Byron Clayton, Gail Ewart, Steve Gano, Hall Guttormsen, Brian Hansberry, Sally Hood, Brett Juul, Mark Kinslow, Roger Livingston, Phil McClellan, Bob Pinotti, John Prychun, Wendy Schink, Rod Therriault

Facilitator: Phil McClellan, Mark Kinslow

Scribe: Sally Hood

Phil opened the meeting by reviewing the *New Attribute Fields for ORMAP Goal 4* document, and the Draft of the *Reliability Targets* documents. He also reminded the group that the Goal 4 expectations needed to be revisited. Asking, "Should the completion date be moved or should the completion percentage be adjusted?" The Advisory Committee meets October 5th and would like suggestions for Goal 5. The suggestion that keeps recurring is multiple projects that would give the counties a choice to meet their individual needs so they can continue progressing towards the ORMAP project goal of developing a statewide property tax parcel base map.

Mark listed the objectives of the meeting:

- Reach a consensus on something to give to the advisory meeting that is
 - achievable,
 - useful, and
 - helpful to A&T functions.
- End the meeting by 3:00 pm.

Rod asked if this is the final word for the ORMAP Goal 4 Technical Specifications. It was agreed it would be.

The information resulting from this meeting will be distributed for review to those attending prior to being distributed to others.

It was noted that this discussion needs to separate ORMAP from FIT.

Also, it was noted that Elizabeth Harchenko (DOR Director) makes the final decision on tech group recommendations.

Mark presented the three Goal 4 options as listed on the agenda under topic 2: The ORMAP Advisory Committee has asked the ORMAP Tech Group to come up with options for Goal 4 and to determine if Goal 4 is even attainable with the current definition and specifications.

- A. A new document that modifies the ORMAP Goal 4 Technical Specifications redefined as the *ORMAP Assessor Map Reliability Targets*
- B. Leave the document as is but redefine the percentage complete and the delivery dates.
- C. Add two new attribute fields, *MapClass* and *Goal 4*, to the Data Exchange Standard and populate the ReliaCode in the taxlot shapefile table.

Discussion on A: A new document that modifies the ORMAP Goal 4 Technical Specifications redefined as the *ORMAP Assessor Map Reliability Targets*

Corrections to the draft document:

Keep Minimum Critical Elements. Add it to the DOR document (ORMAP Goal 4 Methodology).

Page 1: 80% needs to be noted in the document explaining the ReliaCode.

Page 1, ORMAP Goal 4, 3rd bullet: County boundaries agreed upon by County Assessors changed to *Mapped* county boundaries agreed upon by County Assessors.

Page 1, #4: Replace “No COGO features are *changed* or warped...” to “No COGO features are warped (*rubber sheeted*)...”

Page 1, #5: Change *Qualified* Cadastral Cartographer to *Professional* Cadastral Cartographer. Make change to all references in the document.

Page 2, #6: Replace *qualified* with *professional*. Replace *Reliacode* with *MapRelCode*.

Page 2, #8: Replace *Federal Geographic Data Committee* metadata with *Oregon Metadata Standard*.

Page 2, Disclaimer: *Note* that it goes with all data.

Page 2, last paragraph: Change *resource references* to *farm/forest*.

Page 3, chart: Change *resource* to *farm/forest*.

Page 4, #1 (Chart): Change *Resource* to *Farm/Forest*

Page 4, #3: The tax lot acres as calculated....percent of the *assessment* acres changed to *correct* acres.

Page 4, #3 (Chart): Change *Resource* to *Farm/Forest*

Page 5, #4 Edge Matching: a suggestion about the statement language being parallel was made but it was agreed the language was understandable.

Page 5, Data Delivery and Sharing: *Delete* this section.

Discussion on B: Leave the document as is but change the percentage complete and delivery date, which right now is October 2008.

Dean suggested changing the percentage and making it clean. Don't change the date of Goal 4.

Brett noted that it would expensive to verify which maps contain the minimum critical elements.

Dean concurred and said it would be unreasonable to go back and look at each map. It would be easy to build specifications to test the accuracy of each map. A macro could provide an automated test and spreadsheet to list the accuracy of each map.

Cress agreed that it would be time consuming but not onerous to go through that procedure.

Dean suggested that the map would be tested and if it failed, a justification would be made as to why it can't be improved.

Bob suggested that DOR District Managers should be checking with the counties to make sure they are doing Goal 4 mapping correctly. Several people agreed that they like it when the managers visit the counties.

It was agreed that when the ORMAP Goal 4 methodology is followed the map meets ORMAP Goal 4 and the map should meet Goal 4 Technical Specifications.

Some people were interested in exchanging methodology information. Hall offered to share IDS methodology. Phil requested anyone with methodology they would be willing to share could send it to him and he will post it on the ORMAP site.

Cress brought up the question of how to measure location accuracy (control points). Dean said they the maps are not authoritative statements about surveying; they are just assessor maps.

Dave suggested changing the reference from *accuracy* to *internal control*.

The disclaimer language was discussed and it was suggested to check with OSBEELS. Phil will do that.

A discussion regarding exception areas brought up the question of limitations. Is there a limit to how many tax lots or a percentage a county can have in exception areas?

The group decided that there would not be a limit as long as the metadata can justify why it is an exception.

Can the exception area be remapped at a later date? Phil explained that once an area is mapped as an exception area, it no longer qualifies for ORMAP funds. That may be an option for Goal 5: remapping exception areas.

The cartographer's professional opinion can provide justification as to why an area needs to be remapped. Phil also brought up the question of matching funds if the county does decide to remap an exception area; should the county bear some of the financial responsibility for remapping an exception area? Should they have to justify the original remap by citing control points, orthophotos, surveyor maps, or methodology?

The test document will be a joint development by Polk County, Lane County Public Works, and Department of Revenue. The intent will be to accurately reflect whether the map meets Goal 4 standards or not. It should be simple, and automated. It should measure things the cartographer can see, document reliability, and define exception areas. A vote was taken and it was decided that every map would be tested for Goal 4 standards. The test should be a tool to flag areas that don't meet Goal 4. Some areas will be exception areas; some will need to be remapped. Mark suggested that ORMAP funds might be available to develop the test document; he will look into that further.

The question was raised what percent will be done by 2008 based on the business plan that are submitted for each county. Could each county let Phil know how many tax lots and how many tax maps the counties have to Goal 4? The information given to Rod to produce the statewide map will be a good indicator.

Discussion on C: Add two new attribute fields, *MapClass* and *Goal4*, to the Data Exchange Standard and populate the *ReliaCode* in the taxlot shapefile table.

MapClass	Goal4	Reliacode
U = Urban	A – meets or exceeds tech specs	
R = Rural	B – does not meet Goal 4 ~ needs work	
F = Farm/Forest	C – excepted from Goal 4	

Each map would be evaluated for this, not every taxlot.

Andrea suggested in an e-mail from August 23, 2006, that the review for Goal 4 be shifted from tech specs to methodology.

The purpose of this information is to determine how many maps are to Goal 4 and how many aren't. The **MapClass** and **Goal4** columns work together to imply map reliability. The suggestion was made to drop the Reliacode because it might be confused with ground accuracy. The *ReliaCode* field will not be dropped from the shapefile table; it will not be populated at this time.

A clarification was made on the tax map vs. tax lot ReliaCode. If the test is run on the shapefile that is given to Phil and the map meets Goal 4, is it assumed therefore that all tax lots meet Goal 4? No. An explanation of how the Reliacode is derived is in the metadata.

The group decided to keep both the MapClass and Goal4 information. The Goal4 column was renamed MapRelCode. The chart does not include the former ReliaCode column.

MapClass	MapRelCode
U = Urban	01 – Meets or exceeds tech specs
R = Rural	02 – Goal 4 not met, needs work
F = Farm/Forest	03 – Excepted from Goal 4

Actions

Phil: send the revised document to attendees for feedback.

Phil: send out samples of Goal 5 options to tech group members and get feedback.

Sept 26th – Mark and Phil will be meeting with Elizabeth Harchenko.

September 2006 – Phil will add GCDB to recommended Control Quality Tables.

October 2006 – Phil will gather and post methodologies for access by all counties.

October 2006 – Phil will send the disclaimer to OSBEELS for review.

January 2007 – Polk County, Lane County Public Works, and DOR will develop requirements for an automated test procedure for the maps.

Mtg Adjourned 3:00 pm