

1st Fall 2008 ORMAP Tech Group Meeting
Aug 28, 2008
Salem Field office

Facilitator: Phil McClellan
 Scribe: Wendy Hernandez

Present:

Merri Seaton	Department of Revenue	David Cutting	Lane Co.
Rick Schack	Department of Revenue	Cress Bates	Lane Co.
Rod Therriault	Department of Revenue	Tom Brateng	Polk Co.
Roger Livingston	Washington Co.	Chuck Perino	Crook Co
Steven Baldwin	Yamhill Co.	Hall Guttormsen	IDS Inc
Brian Hansberry	Yamhill Co.	Dave Barbour	Tillamook Co
Steve Ganoë	Marion Co.	Wendy Schink	Tillamook Co
Bob Haas	Deschutes Co.		

Teleconference:

Craig Ferris	Clackamas County
Andrea Westersund	Multnomah County
Bruce Fichtman	Klamath County
John McCafferty	Josephine County

Introductions: Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

ORMAP funding report June 2008: There were no questions on that report.

Question on Grant applications:

Clackamas County:

1. The per taxlot cost is unusually high at \$52.00. What is the reason?

They state that they are replacing a portion of grant #1801, so have the funds for that grant been awarded or reverted?

Craig Farris: Per completed tax map cost.

2. Also, have they gotten a plotter grant from ORMAP previously?

Craig: No, Clackamas County has not gotten a plotter yet from ORMAP.

3. On 11 page 2, does this qualify as a partnership (w/ Assessment)

Craig: No

Cress Bates: I just want to be sure I understand the deliverable on this one. I think they plan to add additional layers of information to an "ORMAP/ESRI compliant geodatabase" in order to have the necessary layers to create a final map. But a lot of the grant talks about just doing quality control work and identifying missing cartographic elements. So I wasn't completely sure if the grant was only for QC work or the main thrust was to actually create data.

Craig: Average 65 tax lots per map. 83% completed are in urban, 17% rural. 65,000 tax lots for project.

Would like a sentence added that states that maps will be produced.

Craig: Yes, the result will be a completed map.

Add as part of B2- describe the approach.

Craig: Will add

Coos County:

1: The contribution listed for the county surveyor has been used in 2007 and 2006. Don't these values ever sunset? How long can they continue to claim this as a contribution- it was paid for, in part, through an ORMAP grant in 2004 Survey control dollars.

Coos County (via Hall Guttormsen, IDS): The 2004 grant was for 230 control points, half (115) of which were funded by ORMAP. To date the surveyor has provided a total of around 700 control points and is still contributing high order control points. These points range from 1/16 corners, 1/4 corners, section corners, meander corners, subdivision block corners, road centerline control points, and lot corner locations in problem areas. He is still assisting BLM in verifying corners on dependent and independent surveys which accounts for an additional 131 high order control points. This does not include the 711 high order NGS points which are referenced in numerous recorded surveys and highway surveys such as US 101 and the other state highways. The county surveyor is still very actively contributing additional control to help support the re-mapping project.

Original grant was for 240 control points, 1/2 by ORMAP. Surveyor provided 700 points. Not counting BLM points and does not include high order NGS points.

Looking at the status map, which phases/areas have been completed?

Hall: Area 1 & 2 are complete and have been turned over to Surveyors office to validate.

Crook County:

1. Historic costs for services (one of our ORMAP documents) put the cost of goal 3 & 4 tax lot conversion at \$20/taxlot. This proposal has the per/tax lot cost coming in at \$26.33; which is slightly high. Can they explain the higher than average cost?

Chuck Perino: There was no increase. 2006 costs are \$23.10. Last fall was \$26.33

2. Edge matched? The area to be worked isn't on the edge.

Chuck: The township will be edged matched, but not the entire county. A small portion is on Deschutes county line.

Phil: What percentage of the taxlots are long the Deschutes County line? You may be eligible for extra points.

Curry County:

1. This one also has a high cost per -- \$31.11/taxlot. In the description of the technical approach, it seems like items 1 & 2 actually relate to putting control data in place. Perhaps they should show a cost for taxlot creation and for control work. Might lower their tax lot costs.

John Hawkins (via phone): Curry County has a higher cost per tax lot because of the lots along the coast which have an ambiguous description due to the ocean shores vegetation line. This price was based on previous efforts done in Curry County and was given to me by Merri Seaton, at DOR. No money for control points were asked for, we have the control points in place for the year's project. It was also expressed to us that if control points were needed then we would be told where. My concern is that for next year we will not have control in place.

Tech took longer to do control due to the coast line. Need added hours to complete.

2. The cost is higher than other DOR-produced tax lots.

John: Many tax lots on coast. We gathered all points from NOAA and the Corp of Engineer has control where they have completed dredging.

3. GIS coordinator listed in partnerships but is getting \$2500 from ORMAP.

John: This money is for checking the product when it comes back to DOR.

4. Who will be responsible for Quality control? Says DOR but earlier it says GIS coordinator.

John: DOR is still responsible for quality control. Curry County will be in addition to this.

Need to be clear on what type of quality control DOR will do and what County will do. This will need to be addressed in an addendum to the grant application.

5. Other issues imply possible large reduction in the grant? It would drop the number of tax lots to 305-will this reduce the total grant cost?

John: If the work done in 2006-07 deem acceptable then it would result in a reduction of the grant. At this time there is no indication that this would be the case (this was work completed by the cartographer before he left and has not been through QC)

One of the townships was never completed. DOR may need to complete county's work. If county's work can be used, will reduce cost.

6. Does not appear to match business plan (\$45,805) requested vs. (\$28,000) in plan.

John: The business plan has been adjusted to reflect what is in the grant.

Deschutes County:

1. Seems as if the cost per tax lot is actually \$13.17 (64,465/4,895).

Bob Haas: Both questions are part of same question. Segregate work activities with two separate products. ORMAP compliant tax map – work necessary to produce tax maps when remapping completed. Sometimes have tax lots available from previous grants. Have proceeded this way in the past..

Phil: Similar to what other counties are doing. Doing tax lot work and doing “rest of work”. Some people do it one way, some another.

2. Are they delivering 80 maps as one part of the project and 4,895 tax lots as another part of the project? I'm not sure why the cost per map and cost per tax lot were split. The cost is still low and it is a continuation of their on going project.

Bob: No, 35 of the tax maps have tax lots remapped. 1,475 TL will not be producing any tax maps.

Josephine County:

1. Where are the control points, how many and who is going to collect the points.

John McCafferty (via phone): Control points- DOR. How many-50. Surveyor will be collecting the points. Should be complete by the end of year.

Rod: Quality of points in GCDB. Think we have already received this but don't use this because of mistakes. Build PLSS ourselves because of foreign data inside of shape point.

Hall: BLM has data.

2. \$400 per point seems to be a lot for this. I understand this is what was given in 2007. This is not a remote township. I understand that the costs for surveying can be quite high in some parts of the state. However, could this be looked at more?

Phil: Less than some request; more than other. Fall within range of what we've granted in the past.

Hall: Not bad price for survey grade done by a surveyor.

Wendy: Needs more description to see if worth the cost.

Phil: Need to describe quality of control they will get?

Wendy: Yes.

Phil: Will talk to them about it.

Klamath County:

1. This is a very large Grant. Could they break it up into smaller segments?

Bruce Fichtman (via phone): The current business plan was developed a while ago and I will update it fore next cycle and it will be rephrase.

2. What would happen if this project were extended?

Bruce: I don't know how many townships will be affected yet. Will see if they can get an estimate.

Bob: Cost of total project - Update townships should be converted into a per tax lot basis.

Multnomah County:

1. I assume the edge matching referred to in the business plan matches the proposal in the 2 townships proposed?

Andrea Westersund (via phone): Yes, edge matching is part of the process being funded by this request. Clackamas is adjusting tax lots to fit.

Phil: How many tax lots on boundary?

Andrea: Don't know, but it would be simple to find out.

Phil: What percentage of 76,000 TL are on Clackamas boundary? With the new funding criteria that we are using this cycle [and proposing for administrative rule] you could receive additional points for taxlots along the county boundary.

Andrea: Not an edge matching request. Just one of the factors. Not doing anything special because border has been established. One of the first ORMAP grants was to establish Multnomah/Clackamas border. Probably less than 1%.

2. Does this finish Multnomah County?

Andrea: This finishes this phase of the work as described in our business plan to meet ORMAP goals 1-6. We may ask for additional funding to meet future ORMAP goals or changes to the current standards. This is final phase it will be finished.

Washington County:

1. Are the historic plats you mention (those cogo's by ESU) also tied to accurate control or do you have to so that work as well? NO. In section B. 12, you describe as an innovation that you have lack of control in some areas so some maps will have to be placed in "stasis." Can you provide more detail on that innovation?

Roger Livingston: No. Relatively easy to put together if we had someone to put these together. Just “handing there” until we get control. Numbers represent priority for control. Beaverton was #9 because they told us they would get control for us. Has fallen through because they haven’t had money. Leveraging COGO data, creating maps, maps will be complete – close to where they belong.

Steve: Basically you’re at Goal 2?

Roger: Not a spatially accurate map but map internally is accurate. Just needs to be moved when they get control.

Bob: What is process to move?

Roger: Don’t put into library until they get control.

Cress: What goal is this meeting? In order to meet goal 4 and above must tie to accurate control. 2nd step is to get control and move into right locations (not on request).

Phil: Goal 3-6 is a %. When a county reaches G3, 50% of the tax maps in the county meet the ORMAP tech specs. Must be able to produce tax map; also has control requirements. Must meet spatial accuracy. Roger’s maps receive everything but spatial.

Bob: What happens when you move them?

Roger: Just a move. Don’t transform our stuff; everything stays the same. Literally moved. No translations,

Cress: May have to do work around plat. Entire area not covered by plat data.

Roger: Picked area because they have lots of plats. Get as many maps in as little time as possible.

Tom: COGO and stick together. Will eventually find rotation problems.

Roger: We won’t have that problem. Have good data. Got 6” of play.

David: Are they close now?

Roger: Will replace goal 2 stuff. Will be close to where they belong already. Can’t run tool because we don’t have enough control per area.

Cress: Back to DOR to determine what goal is being made.

Phil: 70% of tax maps meet goal 4?

Cress: Concern with process. Try to get control stuff ahead of time.

Roger: Has some control but not corners. Have done some control work.

Cress: We didn’t start building our tax lot layer until we had control. Cover cost of getting control internally or use ORMAP?

Roger: Don’t know.

Phil: Be careful. Once you say it's done you can't come back later when you have better control.

2. \$10,000 for a software license, please explain further.

Roger: License is \$9,900. Will need to buy another one.

Yamhill County:

1. 2,000 tax lots are being delivered as part of this grant. Does this work also to produce complete maps? If so, how many?

The project area (townships 5S4W & 5S5W) includes 78 maps. Focusing deliverables on tax lots.

Arc Map Users Group:

1. Total project cost \$16,900, the contributions are \$10,150, and shouldn't the grant be for \$6,700?

Opposite. Should be \$16,900 + \$10,150 as total. Only asking for \$16,900.

Shouldn't request have total project cost, and then subtract out other contributions? This seems confusing.

May take a lot of work to figure total cost.

To avoid confusion break it down more so it will be understood better.

2. I cannot determine what the deliverables are. Does the project spec sheet have something to do with it because the project doesn't appear on deliverable list?

Can identify on 1st page. Deliverables will be available for anyone to download

Bob: identified on first page. Happy to specify more. Deliverables will be available for anyone to download.

Wendy: Deliverables under cost of total project?

Bob: Yes. Can add to other area.

Phil: Probably should add.

Bob: Will provide revised version.

Deliverables under cost of total project?

Yes. Can add to other area.

Will do a revised version.

Phil has asked everyone to complete a checklist for each grant request. If there are differences, they will be discussed at next meeting. Phil will complete the DOR checklist and will send it out for others to look over around Sept 12th.

Goal is to follow ORMAP draft under ORMAP technical committee.

Cress: Do it for our county or for all counties submitting grant

Phil: Everyone do it for everybody. If it doesn't "match," we'll discuss.

Bob: One concern is that we don't have time to score anyone else's. Tech committee does pass/fail. DOR should take first stab and pass it around.

Phil: Will do matrix on points awarded and send it to county. Ask county for concerns about their scoring. Will discuss at next tech group meeting.

Hall: DOR has better perspective. Perhaps differences because county hasn't explained their process well.

Issue will probably come up that we haven't expected. The group needs to discuss and make decision so that they will know how to score in future. How much money you spend determines how many points? Issue that might come up in discussing grants.

Phil: This is a test run, these criteria are not totally set in stone.

Bob: Consistency in scoring is key. DOR does initial scoring; share with county and give county chance to object and opportunity to make case to tech group at 2nd meeting. Prior to next meeting, send out matrix and see if folks have any questions about scoring. Results in least amount of work and most consistency.

Roger: Do disagreements go to Phil for resolution or must be resolved in tech group?

Bob: Other non-resolvable issues goes to tech group.

David: Fits in better with our draft process. So all grants passed DOR criteria shown in funding criteria?

Phil: Yes.

David: Scoring reviewed by tech group in 2nd meeting. Referred to draft proposal for process.

Cress: Way for us to make sure we are comparing apples to apples.

Phil: One question - #2 on administrative review for DOR – more than 2 outstanding grants. Does hardware/software count?

Bob: I think we excluded that. (Agreement by group.)

Brian: What is timing? Two outstanding grants when we decide or when project starts?

Cress: I think it should be at time grant is awarded. When DOR approves or when project starts?

When contract is effective.

Steve: If you asked for extension on current, wouldn't be able to ask in next process?

Cress: Maybe get revocation.

HR: Make sure grants end in December and June. No more than two active grants. Grant extensions could affect current request.

Cress: Revert money from current and try to finish later.

Phil: Contracts often broken down into Control, TL, QC. Two different people billing. Once county is satisfied work is completed, can't come back for more money. Polk County example. Not invoicing every month; invoicing at end. Looks like large amount "hanging out there". Is an invoice preference, not a problem.

Cress: Other caveat is two outstanding single county grants.

Dave: Add "non-hardware/software" so "two non-hardware/software single county grants".

Phil – Grant reduction requests have been sent to all the counties who submitted grant applications. Went out to everyone with Agenda.

Roger: Remind counties that they get future preference points if they voluntarily drop out.

Phil: Remember you can't "bank" the points.

Wendy: Re point #5 regarding data sharing agreement.

Phil: Good segue to Bob. Advisory group added it to scoring. Because agreement isn't available now, no one will get points for this for the fall cycle.

Bob: Update of Cadastral FIT data-sharing.

Cress: Quick review of data-sharing project with DOR and DAS. Purpose is to limit data to other state agencies (excludes education institutions). First round was looking at DOR/DAS agreement. 2nd round – looking at agreement between DOR and county. Looked at a 3 way agreement but decided that it would just be between dept and county (no DAS). Milt Hill is getting ?? answered on how to work money and billing and determining contract language. Close to being able to send out for review.

One of the requirements of sharing data is sharing in accordance with CDES and fully populating all tables (ownership). Starting to hear that there are problems in counties with being able to comply with this. Has had a conversation with Lane assessor and with Bob.

Bob: We've run draft before assessors and ownerships is a HUGE issue, even with those counties who have been open to sharing data in the past. Fearful of having DOR "sell" this to assessors.

Rick: Is there a change in response if the ownership name issue is redefined to everything except that proscribed by law?

Bob: This is our assessor's issue.

Rick: Is it all or nothing?

Bob: All ownership information. Don't think this will go forward unless ownership is optional.

Hall: Recording fees are a fee and fed ex order says it is public if tax dollars are used.

Bob: County assessor is cognizant of that.

Phil: Is it just the names? Can we just say don't send first and last names?

Merri: Didn't we add exception for law into last draft? Also, didn't original idea pitched to

OGIC specifically include this?

Bob: Have talked with Cy. Feels he wants more data form greater number of counties rather than more complete data from a few. However, OGIC hasn't OK'd this.

Phil: Would like to know if names could be stripped out and include everything else.

Bob: Could be a way around it.

Cress: Agreement is only for internal state purposes.

Rod: Want to be able to get data in standard form. Now getting it in different ways and have to program to get it in same format. If in CDES, can use it more easily.

Cress: Our assessor will sell a CD with name, etc. What are we doing that's different? Linking it to something that is spatial. Maybe provide lots and ownership separately and specify that you can only join them for a specific project.

Bob: Assessors being pressured to suppress and to share. Looking for more comprehensive review of the situation in light of new distribution channels. Trying to tie agreement into putting pressure on state to look at issue comprehensively.

David: Not just the assessor. Must convince assessor so they can convince commissioners. Need to get commissioners "in on" state-wide GIS.

Phil: As commissioners change, more and more see value of GIS and what it can do. Changing a little bit – overall getting a little better.

Rod: Legislature funded ORMAP and they expect something out of it.

Bob: For ORMAP, don't need to provide information, it's optional. Should this group put energy into trying to remove property tables?

Phil: Having gone to GPL meeting, the selling point was the overwhelming selling point.

Bob: What if they know there's resistance?

Phil: GPL meeting coming up in September in Salem (18th?). Could talk to that group; pushed idea with OGIC. However, individual owner's name is not as important as address information so that they could mail.

Rod: GPL is not just state agencies. Anyone can come. Meet once a month, if you have something you want to bring up.

Phil: GPL is tech group for OGIC.

Bob: Think it would be good to bring up at next meeting.

Phil: Brady Callahan at Parks is chair.

Cress: Send survey to asking what county would be willing to provide? Send to assessor?

Bob: Need direction from DOR since they will coordinate.

Cress: Have asked DAS what they want. Milt wants to go as is and see what happens. However, if we are going to get a very low level of participation, DAS may rethink.

Rick: Thought we would have meeting with assessors in October but now has been moved to December. Could do it electronically.

Roger: Ask GPL why they need ownership names?

Phil: Probably need more for mailing purposes. Need to get a hold of somebody for something. E.g. Water Resources able to notify people downstream of a leak upstream.

Rick: Is Milt forging ahead or has this issue put it in limbo?

Cress: Milt's hope is that we go forward and see what happens.

Bob: Survey OK but probably should come from DOR.

Hall: Should this go to commissioners?

Bob: DOR should know. Do it correctly so folks don't "come up in arms".

Rick: If group wants DOR to take it on, we'll be happy to fill that role. Some logic to dept making that survey.

Cress: I think it would be helpful to have that to see how many counties would participate.

Bob: Check with GPL first to see how important owner name is; then do survey.

Rick: Phil talk with GPL, department send survey and report back to Cad FIT.

David: What is attractive to the commissioners?

Cress: \$1,000 is to cover costs for providing information.

Phil: Take topic to GPL to ascertain how important name information is. Will send date and time info to meeting.

Steve: Address suppressed owner information one way or another.

Merri: Will touch base with Milt so that he knows what he is doing.

Phil: Next meeting will go over points and to “conflict resolution” on points. Will be getting grant reductions from county. Will send points to counties sometime after next week. Have it by Sept 11 or 12. County has a week to review and talk with Phil if they disagree on points. Will send out as completed; everyone will have before 12th.

David: Addendums – will we get those? Submit grants again as revised? Include as letter along with the reductions.

Steve: Are we OKing all of these for technical?

Phil: I assume that we are, with changes to application.

David: Do points based on conversation today.

Hall: In April meeting, software did not have full funding. Have one this time.

Phil: Last time, didn't have funding criteria. Now will apply criteria.

Hall: Umatilla may questions this. They indicated they didn't resubmit request because they thought it would automatically rejected.

Phil: Rejection was ultimately because there were insufficient funds. Based on Phil's determination at time; did not set precedent.

Hall: Will let Umatilla know that they can resubmit in next process.

David: Are reduction packages reviewed?

Phil: No.

Roger: If you can't do a project because of reduction, does it count as voluntary withdrawal?

Phil, Rick, Merri: Yes. (Tom)

Should be no more than 2 outstanding grants for Single County @1 time. Could run into problems otherwise.

If necessary will ask counties for reduction requests. They were sent out with the Agenda.

Reminder; Counties can get future preference points if they voluntarily drop out. You cannot bank the points.

Update of Cadastral FIT data sharing:

Purpose is to limit data to others state agencies (excludes education institutions). First round was looking at DOR/DAS agreement. 2nd round- looking at agreement between DOR and county. Milt

Hill is working at getting Questions answered on how to work money, billing and determining contract language.

There were concerns that if Owner name/address will be included that most counties will not participate and then it needs to be looked at if it would be worth it if in the long run no county wants to participate. We need clarifications on if it's just a name issue. Unless excluded by law. Site address- owners address. Some assessors are having problems with this. Seems they have to convince commissioners on this.

DOR will send out a survey to see how everyone feels about data sharing. And whether to include/not include name.

DOR will let cadastral fit group know after talking to the GPL how they feel and results of survey. Will ask about suppressed ownership info also. Owners name is not as important as address information so that they could mail.

Merri Seaton will touch base with Milt so that he knows what is going on.

Next Meeting:

Next meeting will be Sept 18th @ the Salem BLM office. Directions on the ORMAP website. Will go over points. Points will be given by Sept 12th. County has a week to review and talk with Phil if they disagree on points.

Meeting adjourned @12:40.