

Spring 2008 ORMAP Tech Group Meeting Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2008
10:00 am – 2:15 pm
Salem Field Office

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Eileen Ystad	Clatsop County	Krysta Hess	Clatsop County
Christine Luopa	Jefferson County	David Cutting	Lane County
Cress Bates	Lane County P.W.	Bob Haas	Deschutes County
Rod Therriault	DOR	Wendy Schink	Tillamook County
Byron Clayton	BLM	Hall Guttormsen	IDS Inc
Dave Barbour	Tillamook County	Brian Hansberry	Yamhill County
Eric Bohard	Clackamas County	Phil McClellan	DOR
Doug Sackinger	Benton County	Roger Livingston	Washington County
Paul Kauffman	Washington County	Joe Nelson	Washington County
John Prychun	DOR	Donna Morse	Benton County
Scott Valentine	Linn County	Merri Seaton	DOR
Jill Garlough	DOR	Dean Anderson	Polk County

Facilitator: Phil McClellan
Scribe: Jill Garlough

Introductions

Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

Review of Spring 2008 ORMAP Grant Applications

Clatsop County: Krysta Hess

This project focuses on one township – T8N10W – and will produce taxlots. Will this work involve creating the features that are needed to produce a complete map for the township? **Yes.** If so, how many maps? **135**

ORMAP Funding Criteria (See Attachment A)

This spring we have a \$188,000 shortfall. This is a result of the downward trend in housing. Unfortunately there is not enough money to cover all of the grant requests. If possible some of the projects can be reduced or postponed. 2012 is the target date for completion, but this is just a target and can be extended if needed. All the counties with grant applications will receive an explanation letter of why funding is not being given.

Questions-

- Is ORMAP posting scores? Phil said that they could be.

- Is “fluff” being considered? Phil said no.

Fluff is the cost of business to the county. Items that can and should be added are if funds/contributions are received from outside agencies such as BLM or RFDs. The dollar amount if any should be included but does not have to be the actual amount if the number is not known.

- When is the next deposit? Could it be used for the current grant applications? It is in June. This is an option we could present to Elizabeth. It would however slow things up with the next grant application process starting in August. We haven’t done this before. Since there probably won’t be enough money to fund everyone, counties with outstanding balances will probably be asked to wait.

One option is that we could skip a cycle to wait and bring up funds. But the group didn’t feel like that would be an option.

Another would be to take the money and divide it up evenly between the counties giving everyone a consistent funding stream. Many didn’t like that idea, because some counties would not be able to use that money and it would keep counties ready to work from completing projects.

Maybe we need to change our criteria. Roger Livingston had a proposal of a change that could be made. He will send it to Phil and he will share the information with the group

- Does the Tech Group have any input on funding? Yes, but the final funding decisions will be made by the Department and the Director, with the input from the Tech Group and Advisory Committee.

The Techs can help by looking over the proposed grants and making sure they meet technical specifications. The purpose of the Tech Group is to give technical advice and trouble shoot problems the counties may be having. It is a forum to share information and network with others. By reviewing the grant applications, Phil is looking to the tech group to help him identify contracts that may be outside of the technical scope of ORMAPP or those that may be taking a questionable approach to meeting the goals.

Update of “Technical Testing Tool”: Dean Anderson

Dean used the white board to go over the tools he is developing for map testing:

- Area Acreage Test – Compares the legal acres to the measured acres and produces a report of discrepancies.
- Control Test – Checks for the existence of control points in proximity to each map and produces a report on maps that do or do not have sufficient control.
- Accuracy Test – Compares the measured lengths of lines with the text that is found near the lines. Obvious differences are ignored and the percent of good lines per map is produced.

Minimum Data Requirements for ORMAPP Funded Control (See Attachment B)

Phil passed out a draft of Minimum Fields for Control Point Metadata.

FIT Update and Data Sharing/Data Subscription: Cress Bates-Cadastral FIT Chair

Cress invited Milt Hill from DAS to the meeting to give us an update on the Data Sharing and Data Subscription. The goal is to have all Oregon counties to buy into the idea of sharing their data with other state agencies. The goal is to reduce the amount of requests by having the data come from a single source. Counties who would like to participate would request funds from DAS. The monies would go to and be disbursed by Revenue. Two of the concerns brought up by the Tech group are:

1. Would the data be available to state universities?
2. Would names and address be included in the data?

A representative group of five was formed from the Tech Group to give input into the licensing agreement. They are:

- Phil McClellan - DOR
- Bob Haas – Data Sharing Group
- Eric Bohard – County Rep
- Milt Hill - DAS
- Cress Bates – FIT (Cadastral FIT Chair)

The group agreed to stay after the ORMAP meeting to continue the discussion.

Future Agenda Items

Funding criteria.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.

ORMAP Funding Criteria

Revised: 11/21/2006

Requests from Oregon Counties for ORMAP grant funds generally exceed the available fund balance of future ORMAP funding cycles. Because of limited funding, it is necessary that all grant requests meet certain criteria in order to provide a fair and equitable distribution of ORMAP funds.

The ORMAP program, administered by the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR), created this document to communicate the criteria used to prioritize grant requests for ORMAP funds. ORMAP staff review the funding criteria and the priorities on a regular basis, modifications of each may occur based on either the fund balance or changes in the ORMAP goals.

Process

The first step in prioritizing grants occurs during an initial review by the department's ORMAP Coordinator. The county's proposal must meet all of the following ORMAP criteria:

1. Counties must conduct a successful pilot project or demonstrate a successful process. *(pass/fail)*
2. Counties must maintain an online business plan. *(pass/fail)*
3. Counties must not have outstanding ORMAP fund balances or must demonstrate that outstanding funds will be used by project deadlines. *(pass/fail)*
4. The county must have a data sharing agreement in place with the Department of Revenue. *(pass/fail)*

County grant proposals that meet all of the ORMAP criteria listed above are weighted as follows:

Project Type

- a. County edge matching projects – 5 pts
- b. Ongoing projects (as defined in county business plan) – 2 pts
- c. Counties that have completed a low percentage of tax lots that meet the ORMAP Technical Specifications – 2 pts
- d. Counties that are close to meeting the ORMAP Technical Specifications countywide – 2 pts

Technical Priority

- a. Tax lot/tax map improvements or mapping control development – 3 pts
- b. Tax lot and assessor database connections – 2 pts
- c. Software/hardware projects (including enhancements) – 1 pt

Policy Priority

- a. Projects that demonstrate multi-county efforts – 5 pts
- b. Grants demonstrating funding partnerships – 5 pts
- c. Grants that will cost significantly more if not funded in the current cycle – 3 pts

When the county grant request passes all the initial criteria and weighting, the ORMAP Technical Group reviews the proposal. This process is a thorough peer review of the application to ensure it:

- is technically sound;
- uses the most cost effective methodology;
- pursues ORMAP goals;
- has reasonable and measurable deliverables; and
- has a realistic timeline

When the grant request receives approval based on the criteria, weighting, and the Technical Group review, the department considers the funding request for the project. As stated in OAR 150-306.132 and 150-306.135, the Oregon Department of Revenue Director ultimately retains authority for the distribution of ORMAP funds.

Full funding for smaller grants may occur when the project is of priority, the ORMAP fund is healthy and the funds are available. Smaller grant means that the dollar amount requested falls within the bottom one-third of grant dollars requested. The department may also fully fund projects where the grant proposal shows that partial funding is unfeasible for the project or that there is a loss of cost savings or efficiencies to do otherwise.

Attachment B

Minimum Fields for Control Point Metadata

CornerDesc	Description of Corner (W ¼ corner, Sec. 20, T4N, R3E)
CommonName	Short Name for Position
ControlType	Type of Control Point (from BLM)
AutoMethod	Method Used to Collect Control Point (Calculated, COGO, GPS, Converted, Keypunched, Proportion, Survey, or Unknown)
Township	PLSS Township Number (T4N)
Range	PLSS Range Number (R3E)
Source	Name of Document that Contains the Source Information
SourceType	(Restoration, Survey, Subdivision, Aerial Photo, Partition, Deed, or Other)
Easting	X - Coordinate
Northing	Y - Coordinate
Projection	Projection of Coordinate (State Plan N or S, OLP, etc.)
HDatum	Horizontal Datum for Coordinate System (NAD24, NAD83, etc.)
Units	Measurement units for position (International Feet or Meters)
Reliability	Positional Tolerance of the Control Point (±2 feet)
VDatum	Vertical Datum if an Elevation is Given (NGVD29, NVAD88, etc)
Lat	Latitude (degrees/minutes/seconds)
Long	Longitude (degrees/minutes/seconds)

*If there is no value for a certain field you must enter a null of "00".

These fields would be considered "optional" for each point, but would be good to have for all the control collected by an individual or company.

Surveyor	Name of Surveyor
Surveyor ID	OSBEELS License or ID number
Equipment	Type of equipment use to collect control data
Narrative	Narrative of the equipment and techniques use by the surveyor for the collection and recording of the control point.

Below was taken from the BLM's, "Methods of Digital Parcel Mapping."
(http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/nils/references/methods_of_digital.html)

Documentation

The documentation of the geodetic network is an important cornerstone of the parcel mapping metadata. The FGDC has established framework and metadata specifications for geodetic control, which we encourage everyone to follow. Some of the specifics of geodetic control documentation include:

1. Point description and location sketches
2. Observation data

3. *Table of baseline computations with their statistics*
4. *Baseline computation analysis*
5. *Table of loop closures with their statistics*
6. *Loop closure analysis*
7. *Input/output of the network adjustment*
8. *Network adjustment analysis*
9. *Final adjusted coordinate listing with their statistics (accuracy, covariances, etc.)*

After the geodetic control network is completed, the adjusted coordinates can be formatted and submitted to the National Geodetic Survey (NGS) for inclusion in the National Geodetic Reference System (NGRS). Submitting the results to NGS is termed "blue booking." This step involves some extra expense but has some benefits. The main benefit of blue-booking the project is that NGS will publish and maintain the network's coordinates.