

ORMAP Advisory Committee Meeting
Oregon Department of Revenue - Fishbowl
January 19, 2006

Advisory Committee Members:

Greg Baker – SOAO; Linc Cannon – OFIC; Dick Inman – PGE; Dan Linscheid – Yamhill County Surveyor; Bob Harman – OWRD; Clayton Carter - NW Title; Brandt Melick – City of Springfield; Anna Morrison – Lane County Commissioner; Pat Shaw – Gilliam County Assessor; Dan Ross – Jackson County Assessor; Brent Blair - BLM

DOR Committee Staff:

Elizabeth Harchenko – Director DOR; Karen Gregory – PTD Administrator; Brett Juul – Cadastral Unit Manager; Mark Kinslow – CDOT Section Manager; Philip McClellan – ORMAP Coordinator

Audience:

Roger Livingston – Washington County; Jim McClellan – Klamath County; Chris Schaefer – ESU (Oregon Corrections); Hall Guttormsen – IDS; Keith Massie – Jackson County; Steve Ganoë – Marion County; Scott Valentine – Linn County; JeriSue Ponder – Clatsop County; Eileen Ystad – Clatsop County

1. Introduction and Objective of the Meeting – Karen

Karen welcomed the group to the meeting. She gave an overview of the agenda and items to be discussed.

2. ORMAP Coordinator Update – Phil McClellan

Partnerships: (Handouts)

Phil gave an update on past partners and examples of counties that have partnered with other entities to achieve some of the goals of ORMAP.

Potential and Future Opportunities:

Meeting with future partners will be a high priority with Phil in the near future. He has met with a representative from PGE and will follow up on that lead.

County relationships:

Phil will be looking for successes that counties have achieved and applying those aspects to counties that may be further behind in their goals. Visits to counties will be a plan for the future.

Anna Morrison requested a list of the dollar participation and completion level of each county for a legislative meeting. Phil stated that this information would soon be forthcoming.

Goal 2/Website Update:

A target date of April 26, 2006 is for goal 2 update information to be on the website. The address range search will be incorporated. From an address, the correct tax lot can be found and identified. The information available will not include personal information but an address and tax lot number only will be available.

County Status on Data Sharing: (Handout)

Phil distributed a map that displayed an overview of the counties in three different categories: The first group includes counties that have signed the DAS agreement, the second, those that have not signed an agreement and the third group, those willing to share data only with DOR.

A data sharing agreement would allow data to be centrally collected by DOR and then shared by all counties.

DOR is only concerned about the cadastral information represented in the Cadastral Data Standard.

Some counties have security issues, etc. and are reluctant to give information out if they do not know how it will be used. They are asking for certain restrictions and limitations on the distribution of that data. Other counties are willing to share all of their data.

Phil is working with DAS to determine how to move the process along. They are working to put in place an agreement which will make everyone comfortable.

ORMAP Project Accountability:

We are incorporating a higher level of accountability into the process to ensure that ORMAP is receiving the deliverables that it's paying for. As a starting point, Phil has been going through the procedures and past invoices. From this research, he is proposing a new invoicing process which would include a new form. This would be added to the grant acceptance form. Using a standard form will help us track expenditure of funds and production of deliverables and add consistency to the process. We will be meeting with the agency internal auditor to determine if there are other ways to track expenditures and deliverables. We have used a chart similar to the new invoice but it is not always returned. Submission of the new invoice will be required before payment will be made. Keith Massie suggested that the county would need to state on the form whether the project is on schedule and on budget or not. DOR will look into adding this to the form.

Linc Cannon requested to see a summary sheet of how much has been granted to each county and how much each county has received altogether since the beginning of this project and for each cycle. He suggested that this would help to show relationships. Linc will send Phil a spreadsheet with the information he would like to see.

3. ORMAP Policy Review – Mark Kinslow

Review of "ORMAP Policy" document

(a) Review Past Policy (Handout): Past meeting minutes were reviewed and from that information ORMAP policy was summarized.

The Advisory committee felt strongly that the deadline for goal 4 should not be extended.

We do anticipate meeting Goal 3 by October 2006. Goal 2 data is done but has not been delivered on-line.

Mark stated that because there is not enough money in the ORMAP fund, we are trying to find partnerships. Some counties have a greater ability to develop

partnerships and are encouraged to do so. Counties that need more help will then be able to get it.

Brandt urged the committee to consider spending more time and meeting more often over the next year to work through some of the issues that face ORMAP.

- One issue for discussion would be, "What are realistic forecasts"?
- Data sharing and the fund balance will be subjects of discussion.

The next meeting is open except for what constitutes a realistic goal 4 and beyond. We can meet more often if the group determines that it is necessary.

It was suggested that the statement should be made that these are goals; counties should be encouraged to make partnerships but in the event that they are unable to do so, not to become discouraged.

It should be made clear that the ORMAP program does not end with 2008.

Our intent is to create a statewide tax lot base that is sustainable. There needs to be an expectation on the part of the counties that it will be maintained. The policy may need to be adjusted to specifically state these expectations.

We will also be addressing the issue of funding in determining if counties are in the process of moving to goal 4 or at the point of providing maintenance.

b) Publicly Accessible as related to ORMAP data (Handout)

What are the opportunities and issues related to making ORMAP data publicly accessible? What does publicly accessible mean to you?

Comments:

- Greg Baker: The information is publicly accessible. The county can ask why someone wants to use the information but the individual is not under obligation to tell them. DOR should decide where it wants to be in a year with this issue. Legislation will have to be put in place to protect the information. When we begin to provide partnerships and build interaction for this program, people will start to use it and will want to help maintain it.
- Bob Harmon: It would be extremely helpful if we have a centralized theme to overlay with our water rights. It's expensive and painful to find mailing addresses. The information that we obtain isn't for distribution purposes but the need to contact water right holders. Having access to the information on ORMAP would save a lot of money.
- Anna Morrison: Public money pays for us to develop ORMAP and "Joe Taxpayer" should be able to access this information. Some are worried about lawsuits. We can't arbitrarily pick and choose who should get the information. As far as illegal activities, we need to be more specific. Counties sometimes are over-protective. A central repository such as ORMAP is the most helpful.
- Clayton Carter: Since 1996 Yamhill County data has been available for purchase from a California company. Information can be purchased and disseminated at a cost of about \$400.00 a month. ORMAP can give only a third of the information that you can get from a third party company. ORMAP continues to improve and will relieve counties from assisting the public to get information.
- Linc Cannon: Forest land folks are always apprehensive about giving out information. There are people who take information and use it for illegal reasons. Transaction costs should be required. There are valid safety concerns when

making a lot of information available in an easy way. Much of this concern is directed toward the general public.

- Mark: Some county officials do not want their address information publicly accessible.
- Brandt Melick: This group will need to look at how we can protect data from inappropriate uses. However it is critical that we be able to share information. We are looking at sharing information between city surveyors, state, and counties, etc., not just the public. ORMAP will serve a broad base of GIS needs.
- Elizabeth: Concerns have been over the ease of accessing so much. The risk of harmful use has risen. These types of conversations are going on in many places, including debate in the legislature about withholding data. As a group, our focus is on the statewide digital map base. We probably can make decisions about the infrastructure.

Questions we can ask ourselves:

- What can we make possible in order to have the maps?
- What information is necessary for the assessors to do their work?
- What do we do with the information that is confidential under current laws?

There is value added by assembly of information. If we assemble the information we should harvest that information. The Legislature has a responsibility to decide how to protect information.

For purposes of ORMAP:

- How can we structure our product so that we can offer data exchange and protect it under public law?
- How will we work with other groups to give information to people but still protect it?

These two issues would be separate agreements.

Suggestion: A policy issue for this group could be: Should we use the carrot we have to put priority on grant applications for counties that are willing to discuss data sharing?

- Greg Baker: We should decide what we want to make available and then let other groups make their case to the legislature of what they don't want to make available.
- Linc Cannon: Just because something is public information doesn't mean that it should be obtained for nothing. There is an advantage to having transaction costs.
- Elizabeth: Is the vision statement talking about just the map? If it is the map that is accessible what is the information that is needed to create the map? Is it just the map that is supposed to be publicly accessible? Other layers can be subject to agreements that interested groups can agree upon.
- Mark: Right now we are meeting the basic requirements of the Vision Statement.
- Anna: Ballot M 37 claims: Documenting record of ownership is interesting. Proof sometimes hard. Anna would like to know what some of the sensitive issues would be.
- Clayton: We want to know the description of the property, not the identity of the owner. The state should not provide what real estate folks get paid 6% to do. There is no reason for the State to provide legal and water rights information.
- Bearded Vest: Accessibility on the internet of owners is very useful to the law enforcement community to find out who owns what. Every county should give their tax lots to state agencies. He suggested that an analysis of potential impacts be done for which ORMAP can provide funding.

- Brandt Melick: We need to look closely at what information is required to maintain these databases and realize that it may be different than what is published and what is needed to serve the public. If you just start putting data out there without thinking about who will use it and how, there will be problems. There are two questions that need to be addressed:
 - How do we want to address the data sharing issue?
 - How do we want to address methodology of how we will address those components?
- Brent Blair: Federal entities feel a responsibility to every taxpayer information about public land and what is being done with it. We have names and addresses because we have to document federal ownership. We feel an obligation to give this information to the public. Within the scope of ORMAP we are still defining what publicly accessible means.
- Elizabeth: In our initial conversation with the Legislature, we explained that ORMAP is a county by county mapping of the state. The vision that we sought to impart to them was that accuracy and reliability could be created by converting to a digital format. This could be used as a base layer that would be critical to the performance of public services. There was a two part appeal: 1. Making the property tax system function more accurately and 2. Growth of GIS technology. This vision was enough for them to provide a dedicated funding stream. We set up an advisory committee and started. Our sharing with the legislature has been at a fairly high level.

Two functions of this process are to obtain information in order to do our job and making the information publicly accessible. There are concerns that we need to be aware of, but not to solve: Once information is available in a certain form, the current law makes that information available to any member of the public in that format. The anxiety is that lots of data is accessible very easily. This debate needs to happen in the legislature. Some of the concern can be handled through interagency agreements. If the map can serve as a tool, an agreement is still needed between the entities.

Phil received a letter from Jim Kolen. He will forward that letter to the committee.

Mark gave a summary of what had been discussed:

- Publicly accessible implies that the data is available or coordinated via a central repository.
- Making data publicly accessible will encourage partnerships and create efficiencies.
- There is a distinction between having this information available to state agencies and making it publicly available on the web. A future discussion could include how, and what, data should be published for various user groups.
- We need to continue to encourage counties to establish partnerships that will increase the funding stream to continue building this infrastructure. This will be a priority for Phil in the coming months.

c) Fund Balance Policy (handout - spreadsheet) Mark

The spread sheet shows what has currently been approved for the fall cycle. We are now looking forward to the Spring 2006 cycle. Column H shows what we anticipate will come in. There will be approximately \$750,000 in the fund when these requests come in. For the Spring 2006 cycle we will have \$1.2 million in grant requests and only \$700,000 in the fund. The shortfall will continue into the future. This is why we are looking for partnerships and funding sources. The question is how we will

manage this fund. It may be a desire on the part of the advisory committee to not spend the fund down completely, so that at the next cycle we would have funds to finance projects that may be viewed as critical. Is a rainy day fund important, or is getting money out to the county as the projects come along more important? The question for the committee to answer is: Should available funds be encumbered, or should we retain a reserve in the fund...and if so, how much?

Comments:

- Brandt Melick: Some funds should be retained in reserve. It would be helpful to have an idea if it is realistic to have a reserve that will complete certain parts of the state.
- Mark: County edge-matching would be an example of a project type for which we might want to hold money in reserve.
- Dick Inman: If we have a reserve fund, the legislature may want to use the money for a different purpose.
- Karen: The legislature took \$80,000 from the fund in the last legislative session. DOR covered the amount out of other funds, but given the current budget situation, is unlikely to cover any amount that might be taken in the coming session. Money encumbered won't show but unencumbered money could be looked at and taken. The State is in a situation that they need dollars.

Question: What would the committee desire to do regarding the fund balance? Mark asked for a recommendation.

Dan Linscheid moved to spend the money down.

It was seconded by Dick Inman

The group voted yes with one dissention.

4. Funding Criteria – Mark/Phil

Review of "ORMAP Funding Criteria" document (Handout)

Mark stated that we want to have an objective measurement that will help define projects that will be funded.

The first three listed are screening criteria that would warrant a yes or no.

No. 1 would be a pass/fail.

No. 2 emphasis on the word "maintain" (pass/fail)

No. 3 a large fund balance is OK but the project must be completed by deadline.

Comments:

- Some counties have trouble retaining cartographers. The training takes a year and if they move on to a different job, the county has trouble meeting deadlines.
- Mark: We have the ability to grant extensions. Counties must demonstrate a plan on how they will complete their project. Some things are beyond the county control. We don't want to give money to counties that aren't able to spend it.
- Brandt Melick: We need to have assurance that counties will share their data with DOR and support a centralized data sharing agreement. At a minimum they need to agree to share their tax lot information.
- Mark: It should be required that a county has maintenance procedures in place and the project stays maintained. At a minimum they need to share with DOR their data as a requirement of being funded for future projects.
- Pat Shaw: Data should be shared.
- Phil: DAS has been working on one sharing agreement. A list is part of the agreement and is checked off, showing what a county is willing to share.
- Greg Baker: The data sharing terminology is confusing.
- Bob Harmon: There is a need to emphasize the difference between the licensing agreement and data sharing.

Phil: (Explanation of Cadastral Data Sharing Map Handout)

If a county shows that it has not signed an agreement, it does not necessarily mean that they will not share. Some counties feel that they do not need an agreement in order to share. DOR is encouraging that they do need to have some documentation. Some counties are willing to share only with DOR. They are willing to give cadastral information to DOR, but DOR would have to refer requestors back to the counties to obtain information. This map represents a list sent by DAS. There continues to be confusion concerning the DAS licensing agreement. Phil can still obtain the information for the ORMAPP project, but it is other state agencies that don't have access.

Comments:

- Some counties are concerned about third parties that resell information and counties losing control.
- Keith: Even though it is a DAS agreement, DOR should educate the counties about the licensing agreement.
- Mark: We are partnering with DAS to educate the counties on what this means and will attempt to address their concerns. This will be a subject of discussion at the assessors' conference next week.
- Mark: We will add data sharing with DOR, at a minimum, as a criteria for funding. Optional elements in the cadastral data standard will not need to be shared. Only the taxlot line work and mandatory items in the real property table.
- Brandt Melick: Counties who are receiving ORMAPP funding need to share the information with DOR as a requirement to receiving funding. The data license agreement is what counties can use in order to clarify use of data.
- Mark: The committee appears to agree with the need to require counties to share data with DOR in order to receive ORMAPP funds. ORMAPP also needs to stress that ongoing maintenance is critical, but the committee is not ready to make it a requirement for ORMAPP funds.

Future agenda item: Ongoing maintenance will be a subject of discussion for the next meeting.

Funding criteria numbers 4, 5 and 6 are weighted using the following:

Project Type:

- Emphasizes that some projects have more weight than others. Examples:
 - County edge matching: DOR recommends putting it on as a weighted priority.
 - Ongoing projects as defined in county business plans. DOR and tech committee chose to break these projects down into smaller jobs.

Future agenda item: Because the meeting ran out of time, a continuation of the ORMAPP Funding Criteria discussion will be an agenda item for the next meeting.

- Mark: There will be a fund cycle between this meeting and the next and the listed criteria was meant as a base to help counties with their funding cycle.
- Mark asked if there was a consensus of approval for the ORMAPP Funding Criteria. The committee gave a general agreement that these criteria are good for the next grant cycle.
- Dick Inman suggested a 1-10 and a 1, 4,7,10 point spread.
- Clayton Carter suggested that counties be made aware that because of these criteria some of their requests may be failed.

5. Topics for the Spring 2006 Meeting – April 27, 2006
 - a. What constitutes a realistic definition of goal 4?
 - b. Public accessibility discussion
 - c. Continuation of the Funding Criteria discussion
 - d. Advisory Committee: Meet more frequently? Meet more than 2-3 hours? A day?

ACTION: Phil will plan a longer meeting in April and decide then if the committee should have a longer meeting in June.

Linc Cannon: A progress report and grand summary of how much has been spent in each county in a standard format would be very helpful. He will send a spreadsheet to Phil.

Adjourned 12:00 noon.