

Fall 2008 ORMAP tech group meeting
 Sept.18, 2008
 BLM Salem district office

Facilitator: Phil McClellan
 Scribe: Wendy Hernandez
 Time: 10:00 AM

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
John Prychun	DOR	Rod Therriault	DOR
Roger Livingston	Washington County	Paul Kauffman	Washington County
Steven Baldwin	Yamhill County	Brain Hansberry	Yamhill County
Steve Gano	Marion County	Bob Haas	Deschutes County
David Cutting	Lane County	Cress Bates	Lane County
Dean Anderson	Polk County	Hall Guttormsen	IDS
David Barbour	Tillamook County	Windy Schink	Tillamook County
Byron Clayton	BLM	John Hawkins	Curry County
Scott Valentine	Linn County		

Introductions: Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

Fall Grant Scores: A question was posed about what appears to be an inconsistency with Multnomah grant score. They received 5 points for this being their final remapping request, 3 points for being less than 70% done. Wanted to know which is correct. Phil went with what was on their business plan per tax lots completed, percentage wise. Multnomah states this will be their last request and plan on the 30% being completed by years end. They received full funding because if they were cut 15% then they would have to back next year in order to have everything completed, so made sense to get them done now, rather than have to return and ask for more.

Funding criteria review: Everyone would like to see it go through one more cycle before becoming an actual rule. Purpose of making this rule was there were a lot of questions on how Phil came to his decision on the grant requests. There was a lot of back and forth between him and others. So the department decided that they need to make a rule so there is no question on how they came upon their decisions or why grants were reduced the way they were. It is an agency rule. It is up to DOR to distribute the funds so DOR is developing this rule. Once it becomes a rule, it will be the same every year. After a few years it will be looked at again to see if it is in need of any changes.

Needed to have some clarification on the administrative review criteria draft on “have no more than two outstanding ORMAP single county grants.” It was decided that you can apply while there is in active grant out there but you cannot have 2 active grants at the same time. You either extend your current one or apply for a new one and if you’re awarded the new one then you go with the new grant.

Phil will bring this discussion up with the Advisory committee and see about waiting one more cycle before this becomes a rule. He will also see about adding some wording to make it a little easier to understand. If anyone has any further questions or suggestions please let Phil know. We will discuss the outcome at the next ORMAP tech group meeting in the spring.

Concern on ArcMap tools grant request: There was some concern in the wording that it looked like that if one county's tools are being used more then they would get more funding. That maybe it should be an application for software/hardware. The county that is requesting funds for tools must go to Tools committee stating what they need, but the assessors are the ones that approve the grant. It was suggested that money be set aside for the ORMAP tools so they don't compete directly with the counties.

You can go to the source forge site (<http://sourceforge.net/projects/opet>) or to the tools group section on the ORMAP site to learn more (<http://www.ormap.org/cartography/usergroup/tools/>). It was suggested to go to the winter assessor's conference in Eugene coming up in. There is a cartographer's break out session, where some of these tools can be shown and how they are used so they can see if some of these tools would be of use to them and they can contact the cartography unit for help with these tools if needed.

Review: How to handle tools. Have the tools committee be their own entity. One contract has to be signed by all involved. Not add money to the conversion grants. Counties add it under hardware/software. Then state how those tools will be used. Will leave the contracts how they are for now but in the future will do them separately.

The tools group has \$16,900. Phil is going to ask the tools group to put in a reduction package for 50% and let him know what tools they are going to do for that dollars amount and who's going to do them and then Phil will submit or send out a contract to the counties that are going to do them and then each county will get separate contracts for that dollars amount to develop that tool. When submitting for reimbursement Phil will need some sort of letter from the group chair saying "the tool the county said they were going to do for the fall 2008 grant cycle works and is good they will be submitting and invoice for work done on that contract, please pay them." And then you send in the normal invoice to Phil like you normally would and then within a short time have the money.

Department of revenue cartography unit is always available to answer questions and if you are in need of a visit from DOR and would like them to look things over and help just call or ask for a visit and they will help any way they can.

Phil will put more information on the ORMAP website.

ArcMap testing tool: Tools have gone through a testing phase. Biggest issue with the testing was it illustrated some issues with the technical specifications. They have a set percentage where the area calculation that one is not consistent. The map doesn't work when comparing to the lines. The second half is that many of tax lots; the legal area does not match the area that's on the map. There is also an issue of what do you do when your map only has 4 lines that have a dimension on them. One line for 25% of the whole is gone. Third, when you run the tools in an automated fashion, you'll get more error in it. Need to change technical specs. Propose a sub committee group and then come back in the spring with some recommendation.

Recommend taking this issue to the OSACA conference where all the cartographers are. Maybe can get a sub committee group together there.

Cadastral data exchange standard revision: Section 3.8- Map index shape file. This is a standardized format. This is optional format. It is proposed to drop the Autos out of this section, not sure whether Page number should be optional. Will forward this discussion to the fit group.

Meeting adjourned: 12:10