

Special ORMAP Advisory Committee Meeting  
Department of Revenue, Revenue Building  
955 Center St. NE, Room 352  
Salem, Oregon  
July 17, 2008  
10 am – 3 pm

Conference Call: 866-249-5325 code: 664936

10 am: Introductions

10:05 am: Additions to the Agenda

10:10 am: Intro to Administrative Rules – John Phillips, DOR

10:30 am: Discussion “Draft ORMAP Funding Criteria v0.4”

Discussion topics will include:

1. What should be included in an administrative rule? Please review the following:
  - ORMAP Funding Criteria
  - ORMAP Policies
2. Upon application of the rule to the grants, how should the department award funds?
3. Upon successful appeal of a reduction in a grant request; how should the additional dollars granted be funded?

Noon: 30 minute “Working Lunch” (Lunch will be provided for attending committee members only)

12:30 pm: Continue Funding Criteria Discussion

2:45 pm: Review Action Items

3 pm: Meeting Adjournment

## **Draft ORMAP Funding Criteria**

### **QUESTIONS FOR THE ORMAP ADVISORY GROUP**

1. **What should be included in an administrative rule? Please review the following:**
  - **ORMAP Funding Criteria (Exhibit A)**
  - **ORMAP Policies (Exhibit B)**
2. **Upon application of the rule to the grants, how should the department award funds? (See Exhibit B – Level of Funding, Exhibit C – Priority Scoring)**
3. **Upon successful appeal of a grant award, how should the additional dollars granted be funded? (See Exhibit B – Appeals Process)**

### **Background**

Criteria were developed in November 2006 to determine whether grant requests meet the requirements for ORMAP grant funding and to determine how to prioritize the qualifying grants if available funds are less than the dollars requested by the counties.

There were insufficient dollars available to fund all qualifying grants at 100% for the spring 2008 grant process. Various persons raised questions concerning decisions made by the ORMAP coordinator on funding granted. The Advisory Committee decided that DOR, with input from both the ORMAP Tech Group and the Advisory Committee, would draft a proposed administrative rule laying out the criteria. The criteria in the proposed rule will be used for the fall 2008 grant process as part of a trial. Based on that experience, changes may be made to the draft before placing it in the formal rule process in spring 2009.

### **ORMAP Technical Committee**

The ORMAP Technical Committee met on June 12. The committee's recommendations are attached as follows:

- Criteria to place in an administrative rule (Exhibit A)
- ORMAP Policies & Processes to include in an administrative rule (Exhibit B)
- Criteria that is part of the process but not included in the rule (Exhibit C)

The tech committee also discussed the effect of the administrative rule on the grant application process. Once the rule is in place, the technical committee sees the process for awarding grants as follows:

1. Grant applications sent to DOR are reviewed using the DOR Criteria and ORMAP policies in the rule. Counties are given the opportunity to make timely changes to their grant application and resubmit to correct criteria the county did not meet. An application that does not pass all DOR criteria is not submitted to the technical committee for review.
2. The technical committee reviews grant applications that pass the DOR criteria. The committee applies the ORMAP Technical Committee criteria at its first scheduled meeting.

Counties are given the opportunity to correct any failed items by timely providing an addendum detailing the changes to the ORMMap coordinator.

3. Grant applications that pass both the DOR and the technical committee review are scored by DOR using the Priority Scoring points (Exhibit C). Scoring is only required if the grant applications that pass the DOR and tech committee reviews request more funds than are available from the ORMMap project for that funding cycle. Scoring is reviewed by the technical committee at its second scheduled meeting. The technical committee will determine that the rule was applied correctly and that the resulting decisions on scoring were applied in an objective way. The technical committee will review any grant addendums and approve priority scoring at its second scheduled meeting.
4. DOR awards ORMMap funds based on application scores and the funding process chosen from the "Funding Proposals" section (Exhibit B). A county is able to appeal their funding award using the appeals process (Exhibit B).

**Exhibit A  
Draft Rule Criteria**

**RECOMMENDATION:** All of the following criteria are pass/fail. The criteria are divided into two categories, Administrative Review Criteria and Technical Review Criteria. They are recommended for inclusion in the rule, as they will not change from year to year.

**Administrative Review Criteria**

These criteria are applied by the ORMAP Coordinator prior to grant application review by the technical committee. Each criterion is pass/fail. If a county application fails to meet any of these criteria, it is not considered for that cycle's funding. A county is able to revise their application to meet the criteria prior to the ORMAP Technical Group meeting. A county must:

**1. Maintain a current online ORMAP business plan and provide DOR with a status map of the county's ORMAP project phases.**

**2. Have no more than two outstanding ORMAP "single county" grants.**

A "single county" grant is a grant that has only one county named in the grant. Grants that include a partnership of more than one county pass this criteria.

**3. Agree to share data with the Department for its internal uses.**

Data outlined in the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard. **Does not** include ownership information; includes use of the data for the ORMAP website.

**4. Propose a project directed at meeting one of ORMAP's goals.**

**5. Provide ORMAP, by February 1, with the current calendar year's countywide shape file, which meets the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard.**

**6. At the Department's discretion, counties will provide a "reduction package" within the grant application outlining funding reductions of varying percentages.**

To prioritize county needs and help the Department apply funding reductions, if needed.

### **Technical Review Criteria**

Each criterion is pass/fail, if the county does not meet the criteria; the county is allowed to make changes via an addendum following the technical committee's first meeting and prior to the committee's second meeting.

The grant application must:

**1. Demonstrate a successful process.**

A successful process is one that is cost effective and aligns with the ORMAP goals.

**2. Have a completion timeframe not to exceed one year.**

Projects that will last longer than one year must be broken into multi-year projects or phases that will be reviewed each year.

**3. Have a reasonable and measurable deliverable.**

A reasonable and measurable deliverable is a deliverable that can be completed within the one-year timeframe using the methodology detailed in the grant application.

**Exhibit B**  
**ORMAP Policies and Processes**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The ORMAP Technical Committee recommends including the Appeals process and the ORMAP policies in the administrative rule. The committee also recommends including the process for determining level of funding in the rule, but did not have a consensus on what the process should be. Four different options are presented below.

**Determining Level of Funding**

After the DOR and ORMAP Technical Committee reviews have determined the grant applications that meet the administrative and technical criteria, the department scores the approved applications. The department’s scoring is reviewed at the second meeting of the technical committee. The department makes funding decisions based on the scores. There are several different ways the department can apply the scores to funding. A matrix is attached that shows the impact of the different options.

1. The department provides full funding to applications that score in the top 25% based on points awarded per county. If there are insufficient funds to award full funding to the top 25%, funds will be reduced proportionately (same percentage) at the discretion of the department. Alternatively, the department may request and use budget reduction package information in varying percentages from these counties so as to minimize the impact on the deliverables. After distributing funds to the top 25% , any remainder is distributed to the counties in point total order, adjusted as necessary by the department from reduction package information provided by the counties *All counties receive some level of funding.*

**DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

Example: Below is an example as to how this option would be applied, if there is \$260,000 in the fund to be awarded to grants in the cycle.

County	Points	Original Request	Reduction	Adjusted Request
A	22	\$75,000	0%	\$75,000
B	19	\$25,000	0%	\$25,000
C	17	\$50,000	15%	\$42,500
D	15	\$15,000	30%	\$10,500
E	10	\$20,000	30%	\$14,000
F	9	\$65,000	30%	\$45,500
G	8	\$25,000	50%	\$12,500
H	8	\$60,000	50%	\$30,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$335,000</b>		<b>\$255,000</b>

2. The department provides funding to as many counties as possible, ranking each grant application in point total order, with the higher scoring projects receiving preference, taking account of and applying (at the discretion of the department) budget reduction package information, until the funds available are largely depleted (allowing for a slight ending balance). This is distinguished from option 1 by the fact that counties in the top quartile do not receive any preference and county requests with the lowest point totals may not be funded.

Example: Below is an example as to how this option would be applied, if there is \$260,000 in the fund to be awarded to grants in the cycle.

County	Points	Original Request	Reduction	Adjusted Request
A	22	\$75,000	15%	\$63,750
B	19	\$25,000	15%	\$21,250
C	17	\$50,000	15%	\$42,500
D	15	\$15,000	30%	\$10,500
E	10	\$20,000	30%	\$14,000
F	9	\$65,000	30%	\$45,500
G	8	\$25,000	30%	\$17,500
H	8	\$60,000	30%	\$42,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$335,000</b>		<b>\$257,000</b>

- The department fully funds the highest scoring grant applications, in point total order, until the funds are depleted. Lower scoring grant applications are unfunded for the cycle.

Example: Below is an example as to how this option would be applied, if there is \$260,000 in the fund to be awarded to grants in the cycle.

County	Points	Original Request	Reduction	Adjusted Request
A	22	\$75,000	0%	\$75,000
B	19	\$25,000	0%	\$25,000
C	17	\$50,000	0%	\$50,000
D	15	\$15,000	0%	\$15,000
E	10	\$20,000	0%	\$20,000
F	9	\$65,000	0%	\$65,000
G	8	\$25,000		\$0
H	8	\$60,000		\$0
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$335,000</b>		<b>\$250,000</b>

- The department gives full funding to the top three scoring grant applications. The department then splits the balance proportionately over the remaining grant applications taking into consideration budget reduction package information provided by the counties. All requests receive some level of funding.

Example: Below is an example as to how this option would be applied, if there is \$260,000 in the fund to be awarded to grants in the cycle.

County	Points	Original Request	Reduction	Adjusted Request
A	22	\$75,000	0%	\$75,000
B	19	\$25,000	0%	\$25,000
C	17	\$50,000	0%	\$50,000
D	15	\$15,000	15%	\$12,750
E	10	\$20,000	15%	\$17,000
F	9	\$65,000	50%	\$32,500

G	8	\$25,000	50%	\$12,500
H	8	\$60,000	50%	\$30,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$335,000</b>		<b>\$254,750</b>

### Appeals

Appeals of funding awarded may be submitted to the Department of Revenue within 30 days of the funding announcement. The department's Property Tax Division Administrator will hold a telephone conference within 30 days of receiving the appeal. Appeals will be limited to inconsistent application of administrative rule criteria or abuse of discretion. All appeal decisions by DOR are final.

The technical committee recommended that if an appellant is successful and additional funds are granted, the additional funding be deducted from the next ORMAP deposit. For example, in April, a county appeals the reduced funding for their grant. The department holds a supervisory hearing in May and awards additional funding. The monies are deducted from the next ORMAP deposit which occurs in July. As a result of the successful appeal, the funding available for the fall cycle is reduced by the additional amount of funding granted in the appeal.

Other options for establishing funding for appeals:

- "Skip" a funding cycle and use the money to establish an appeal funding balance. When the balance is depleted, skip another cycle.
- Hold all funding for grants until resolution of all appeals. Proportionately reduce funding of non-appealing counties to provide additional funds to successful appellant.

### ORMAP Policies

**Grants Request:** Requests for ORMAP funds are generally made during the grant cycles specified by DOR, typically in the spring and in the fall. A county must complete an ORMAP Grant Application; Form No. 150-304-101-9. The application is available upon request to the ORMAP Project Coordinator. The completed application must be submitted to the ORMAP Project Coordinator no later than the due date posted on the ORMAP website for that funding cycle.

**Pilot Project:** To ensure a quality deliverable, the completion of a successful pilot project is required before the approval of large grant requests or grants using a contractor new to the ORMAP process.

**Work Completed:** ORMAP will only pay for work completed during the one-year timeframe of the contract. Funding is not provided for work completed prior to the date on the signed contract or after the expiration date. All funding requests represent an estimated cost, and unused funds are reverted to ORMAP. In order to receive funds, a county submits an invoice with a detailed list of completed deliverables. No new funds are allocated for cost overruns without technical committee review.

**Funding Personnel:** ORMAP grant applications may be submitted to fund:

- overtime incurred by existing county personnel assigned to complete work on an approved mapping project,
- temporary employees hired by the county to complete project work,
- new, regular status personnel hired to work on the project that is the subject of the grant application.

NOTE: The decision to use contractors, temporary employees, or regular status employees is at both the discretion and at the peril (in the event of insufficient grant funding) of the county. Once the project that is the subject of the grant application is completed, ORMAP funding for staff will cease unless a grant request for another project is approved.

**Large Grants:** If larger grants limit the ability of counties to receive smaller grant requests, attempts will be made to break the larger projects into several smaller projects that can be completed over the course of several funding cycles. In some cases, breaking a large project into subprojects may create logistical issues or add significantly to the overall costs. If a county believes this to be the case, the county is required to provide documentation to support this concern. The Department of Revenue will balance any projected increases in costs with the limitations a large grant places on the ability of other counties to receive ORMAP funds.

**Exception Areas:** Exception Areas are areas within a county that the assessor has identified as having no current (or anticipated) business need or economic return to remap to ORMAP Technical Specifications, at this time. The county must document these areas in the metadata; this will contain an explanation as to why the area does not meet the standards. The county will also fill in the appropriate codes in the attribute table following the Oregon Cadastral Data Exchange Standard (see ORMAP Reliability Codes).

**Data Conversion:** Data conversion requested in a grant application must be part of the county's plan for remapping and included in its ORMAP business plan. If a conversion is part of the remapping plan but the converted data may not meet ORMAP technical specifications, the technical committee will review the data conversion request. If the committee determines the proposed conversion benefits ORMAP goals, the county will be eligible to receive ORMAP funds for the conversion. If a county is already mapped to ORMAP technical specifications, converting existing digital data to a new data format may be considered maintenance.

**Contract Modifications:** The department will allow modifications to an ORMAP contract based on outstanding fund balance, past project performance, and any extenuating circumstances. Counties may apply in writing to the department for a contract modification to change the expiration date or number of project deliverables within the original project scope of the approved grant. The application must explain why the modification is being requested, if it will affect any ongoing projects, current business plan, and when the project will be completed. A modification signed by both the department and the county must be in place prior to the contract's original expiration date.

**The County:** The "county" is defined as the group requesting funds from the ORMAP Project. Only members of county staff may request funds from ORMAP. The county assessor is responsible for all contracts awarded by ORMAP, whether or not the assessor's office is the county department requesting the funds.

**Exhibit C  
Priority Scoring**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The system of scoring is part of the funding criteria but the technical committee recommendation is not to include it in the rule because it may change as the goals of ORMAP change. However, since the level of funding uses the point system, the document containing a description of the scoring system and a date of adoption will need to be referenced in the rule.

Scoring points for technical and policy ratings are combined into a single score.

**Technical Rating**

County grant proposals that meet all of the ORMAP criteria will be scored as follows:

**1. County edge matching projects – maximum of 5 points**

If the requested project will address edge matching of tax lots with neighboring counties it will receive a maximum of five points. The county must have agreements with the neighboring counties affected by the project. The scoring will be as follows:

Percent of project tax lots along a common boundary:

1% - 30%	=	1 point
31% - 70%	=	3 points
71% - 100%	=	5 points

If the county boundary has already been completed, and the county can produce documentation that the neighboring counties agree to the boundary, the county will receive an automatic 3 points on all future grant applications.

**2. Ongoing projects – 2 points**

The project is part of an ongoing, multi-phased project outlined in the county’s online ORMAP business plan.

**3. Completion of a low percentage of tax lots that meet the ORMAP Technical Specifications – maximum of 5 points**

If the requesting county has a low percentage of its tax lots meeting the technical specifications, it will be given points. The percentage of completed tax lots will be taken from the county’s online ORMAP business plan. The scoring will be as follows:

1% - 30%	=	5 points
31% - 70%	=	3 points
71% - 99%	=	1 point

**4. Completion of the county’s remapping (bringing the county to 100% of its tax lots to technical specifications) – 5 points**

If a county grant application brings the entire county to meeting ORMAP Goal 6 (100% of county tax maps meeting the technical specifications), it will receive five points.

### **Policy Rating**

#### **1. Multi-county efforts – 1 point**

Projects that involve more than one county in the production of maps, collection of control, or sharing of resources are considered multi-county efforts. An example is remapping the county boundary where each county involved remaps a portion of the boundary and other counties use that data. Another example is one county developing a tool or process that can be used by other counties. In order to receive points, an agreement with the other counties is needed indicating that this tool or process will be implemented by the other counties.

#### **2. Funding partnerships – 1 point**

A funding partnership is an agreement with another agency or department within the county to provide cash or services to meet the goals of ORMAP. Services that would normally be provided by that agency, such as computer support from county IT services, are not included.

#### **3. Significantly greater costs if not funded in the current cycle – Maximum of 3 pts**

The county must document a significant saving to funding the project in the current cycle versus funding it at a later time or by spreading it out over multiple project phases.

#### **4. Significant contribution of non-DOR resources to completing ORMAP Goal 6 – Maximum of 5 points**

Comparison of the total amount of ORMAP funds expended divided by the number of tax lots that are currently in Goal 6 compliant tax maps. A county in the 75 percentile measured by the lowest cost per tax lot receives five points; a county in the 50 percentile receives 3 points; a county in the 25 percentile receives 1 point.