

Revised Fall 2008 ORMAP Advisory Committee Agenda
 Department of Revenue Field Office Salem, OR
 October 16, 2008, 10 am – 3 pm
 Conference Call: 866-249-5325 ext. 664936

1. Grant Application Review

(see attachment A)

2. PTD ORMAP Grant Funding Recommendations

(see attachment B for Funding Criteria Definitions)

County	Technical Scoring				Policy Scoring						Total
	#1	#2	#3	#4*	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	
Clackamas	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	8
Coos	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7
Crook	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
Curry	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Deschutes	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	3	12
Josephine	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	10
Klamath	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
Lane	0	2	5	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	11
Multnomah*	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	15
Tillamook	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	9
Washington	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	10
Yamhill	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	6
ArcMap Tools	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

* Final Remapping Request

County	Points	Reduction %	Reduction Impact
Multnomah*	15	0%	N/A
Deschutes	12	15%	No Change
Lane	11	15%	A reduction from 7,700 taxlots to 6,545
Josephine	10	30%	A reduction from 50 points to 35
Washington	10	30%	A reduction from 3,018 taxlots to 2,112
Tillamook	9	30%	A reduction from 5,976 taxlots to 4,183
Clackamas	8	30%	A reduction from 1,040 taxmaps to 696
Crook	8	30%	A reduction from 1,536 taxlots to 985
Klamath	8	30%	A reduction from 7,120 taxlots to 4,984
Coos	7	50%	A reduction from 3,960 taxlots to 1,979
Yamhill	6	50%	A reduction from 2,000 taxlots to 1,000
Curry	4	50%	A reduction from 1,392 taxlots to 568
ArcMap Tools	4	50%	3 tools will be developed

County	Amount Requested	Reduced Award
Clackamas	\$59,480	\$41,636
Coos	\$64,706	\$32,353
Crook	\$48,349	\$33,845
Curry	\$45,805	\$22,903
Deschutes	\$64,465	\$54,796
Josephine	\$20,000	\$14,000
Klamath	\$75,260	\$52,682
Lane	\$70,975	\$60,329
Multnomah	\$60,000	\$60,000
Tillamook	\$48,548	\$24,274
Washington	\$44,470	\$31,129
Yamhill	\$26,000	\$13,000
ArcMap Tools	\$16,800	\$8,450
Total	\$670,242	\$459,104

3. Projected Fall Funding Balance

(see Updated Attachment C)

4. ORMAPP Tech Group Recommendations

A. Can we delay going forward with a rule until the draft funding criteria process has been used for another grant cycle?

Tech Group Recommendation: Use these funding criteria for one more funding cycle (spring 2009) before starting the administrative rule process. Some counties request grants on a yearly basis, rather than making requests in both grant cycles. Testing the criteria and process for another cycle will allow those counties who make requests only in the spring to have an opportunity to use the criteria and provide input.

Department Recommendation: The department agrees with the Tech Group recommendation. This would move the effective date for the rule toward the end of the calendar year 2009 instead of the midpoint of 2009.

B. Using a more subjective technique to resolve funding levels for the spring 2009 grant cycle.

Tech Group Recommendation: There was some concerns that the awarding of ORMAPP funds was not objective enough to be put into rule.

Department Recommendation: That a more objective method be found to included in the rule. The department came up with the following procedure with an example using the fall 2008 funding cycle (see Attachment E for an example using the fall 2008 funding cycle):

1. Calculate the percentage of total dollars requested by each counties.
2. Calculate the weighted amount by multiplying the number of points by the dollars requested.

3. Determine the percentage of each county's weighted amount to the total number of dollars weighted.
4. Compare the two percentages. Apply the lowest percentage to the actual dollars available.

C. Create a separate fund within the ORMAP fund for the ArcMap Tools Group?

Tech Group Recommendation: Set aside an amount each cycle to fund tool development. This amount would be a percentage of the total amount available for funding, taken off the top (e.g. 3%, up to \$25,000 per year). The ArcMap Tools Committee would be in charge of determining which tool or enhancement would be eligible for funding and which county would be responsible for the work. The group then submits a grant request outlining the tools or enhancement, which would be reviewed by the Tech Group.

Once the tool is completed, the ArcMap Tools Committee would be responsible for testing the new tool. When testing is complete, the Tools Committee Chair will notify the ORMAP Coordinator that the tool is eligible for reimbursement from ORMAP. Participating counties would be required to provide a county match to the funds provided through by ORMAP.

Department Recommendation: The department agrees with the Tech Group's recommendation. The Tools Committee's work is a vital part of the taxlot and taxmap production. By developing tools, the productivity of the techs doing the work is increased. The percentage and cap would remain at the discretion of the department and its director. (Note: I (Phil) think control should remain with the department. If there were a need to suspend these funds, we would not need to change a written policy or rule.)

D. Change the language in the funding criteria to better clarify Administrative Review Criteria number two, outstanding "single county" grants.

1. Will expiring contracts be counted as "outstanding" contracts when a county applies for new funds? For example, does having a contract that expires on December 31 prohibit a county from requesting funds in the fall cycle?

Tech Group Recommendation: Add language to the funding criteria to better define what the county's options are for overlapping grant applications.

Department Recommendation: Before accepting new funds, the county would have to decide if they wanted to extend the existing contract, which would keep them from being awarded the new contract, or cancel the contract and revert the balance.

2. Include an exemption for counties that have open contracts for tool development with ArcMap Tools Committee?

Tech Group Recommendation: ORMAP contracts with county programmers participating in the ArcMap Tools Group not count as a "single county grant" for purposes of criteria #2.

Department Recommendation: Include clarifying language for criteria #2 to exclude ORMAP contracts with county programmers developing tools as part of the ArcMap Tools Group.

5. 2009 Meeting Schedule

(See Attachment D)

6. ORMAP Advisory Committee Membership

There are a large number of members with terms expiring in June of 2009. I wanted to bring this to the attention of the members so they can start thinking if they would like to continue on the Advisory Committee. In the past, when members resigned, we asked them to suggest a replacement. The following members' terms expire on June 30, 2009:

Brandt Melick
Clayton Carter
Anette Spickard

Orrin Frederick
Bob Harmon
Pat Shaw

Doug Hillpot
Linc Cannon
Dan Linscheid

Attachment A

Fall 2008 ORMAP Grant Applications

Clackamas County
Requested: \$59,480

Outstanding: \$91,352

Grant Overview:

This project is to complete and quality check tax lot maps to make sure they meet ORMAP technical specifications. Funding is to employ additional staff to complete the cartographic elements. These elements include annotation arrow, land hooks, address annotation, plat boundaries, etc... This includes all of the maps in Clackamas County that have not previously met ORMAP technical standards ranging from 1S1E thru 8S8E. I am also requesting a plotter for the Assessors Office. The Assessors Office currently prints colored check copies and copies for distribution on the I.S. plotters, which is located in a different building, because the Assessors office does not have one of their own.

Coos County
Requested: \$64,706

Outstanding: \$10,175

Grant Overview:

Coos County is requesting \$64,706 to begin Phase 8 in Project Area #3. Phase 8 will focus having our vendor COGO 3,960 parcels (278 maps) at a cost of \$16.34 per parcel. The area consisting of 3,960 parcels east of Coos Bay and Coquille was selected to convert as the next urban area.

The GPS points gathered in Phase 1 from the Fall 04 Grant and thereafter will be used to establish the control network Coos County needs to begin the eighth phase in Project Area #3. The Contractor will re-map the Assessor's maps using coordinate geometry based on the control network, filed surveys, deeds, etc. The COGO of these 3,960 parcels will meet the ORMAP Technical Specifications. Assessment will contribute the in-kind match of two Cartographer's time to check the Contractor's work.

Crook County
Requested: \$48,349

Outstanding: \$64,992

Grant Overview:

Crook County is seeking funding for a mapping project covering 1,536 taxlots in 14S15E, 14S16E, 15S14E, 15S15E, and 16S15E referred to as Phase 3. The taxlots are approved for maintenance by DOR and will be added by DOR-CISU for mapping before the township wide geodatabase is created. Section B.3 outlines the precise area, # of taxmaps and # of taxlots to be included in Phase 3. This request will cover project-planning, data gathering, control input, COGO, control base assembly, line-work, text entry, QC, format conversion, and delivery for the areas listed in B.3.

Curry County**Requested: \$45,805****Outstanding: \$0**Grant Overview:

In 2007-08, Curry County budgeted over \$103,000 for Enterprise GIS operations not including an amount, which may be granted because of this request. Part of this amount is contributions from our enterprise partners and other county departments. Additionally the County Assessor has budgeted over \$30,000 for map maintenance activities.

The completion of remapping of those tax parcels in Township Range 34s11w, 34s14w, 34s15w, 35s11w, 35s12w, 35s13w, 35s14w, 35s15w, and 36s13w which will bring Curry County up to ORMAP Goal 5 standard. The Project will meet OR MAP Technical Specifications and the Cadastral Data Exchange Standards.

Deschutes County**Requested: \$64,465****Outstanding: \$26,550**Grant Overview:

The overall project is part of an ongoing, multi-phased project that is dedicated to digitally remapping the Deschutes County taxlot base in areas where the current taxlot base does not meet ORMAP standards and in producing ORMAP compliant taxmaps. For this particular project, Deschutes County proposes to utilize ORMAP funds to convert manually developed taxmaps to GIS generated digital products. The project is also dedicated to remapping taxlots that do not meet ORMAP accuracy requirements. Remapping activities are performed by the Assessors Office working in collaboration with other County GIS staff.

Josephine County**Requested: \$20,000****Outstanding: \$115,364**Grant Overview:

Josephine County is requesting funding for up to 50 control points in township 36s06w. This will allow us to create an inventory of control data ahead of the digital remapping in subsequent grant applications.

Klamath County**Requested: \$75,260****Outstanding: \$53,876**Grant Overview:

This request is for funding to map phase 3 (see Attachment 1) of Klamath County. This phase is the third phase of a nine-planned phases to map the entire county. All county tax maps produced will be compliant with ORMAP Map Methodology and ORMAP Technical Specifications.

Lane County**Requested: \$70,975****Outstanding: \$75,225**Grant Overview:

This request seeks to make up for the reduced funding received from ORMAP grant #1929 (S08 Map Conversion) and to provide for extension of work being performed under grant #1856 (F07 Feature Conversion). This request is to fund a six-month project from January 1, through June 30, 2009. The deliverables for this project are printed A&T maps produced from the ESRI ORMAP data model that meet the ORMAP Technical Standards.

Multnomah County**Requested: \$60,000****Outstanding: \$60,101**Grant Overview:

Completion of Multnomah County ORMAP project for the taxlots in last two townships 1S2E and 1S3E, migrates our current CAD data to a seamless GIS database, and supports Assessor Mapping that meets DOR standards.

Tillamook County**Requested: \$48,548****Outstanding: \$44,994**Grant Overview:

This grant is part three of a multi-year request to integrate new data collected and to improve accuracy of the mapping to meet ORMAP Technical Specifications across the whole county. This grant will cover the remapping of the remainder of townships 2N10W, 1N10W, and a portion of 1S10W, consisting of 5,976 taxlots and 141 taxmaps.

Washington County**Requested: \$44,470****Outstanding: \$48,604**Grant Overview:

This project will fund a GIS intern whose job is to re-map the metro Beaverton area. Data for the project comes from previous ORMAP and other COGO'ing projects. All GIS data has been and will continue to be created in ESRI software and is convertible to all exchange files supported by ESRI GIS software. Maps and data created will meet the current ORMAP Technical Specifications.

Yamhill County**Requested: \$26,000****Outstanding: \$18,343**Grant Overview:

Remapping and conversion of 2,000 taxlots in townships 5s4w and 5s5w to meet ORMAP Technical Specifications.

ArcMap Tools Group
Requested: \$16,900

Outstanding: \$0

Grant Overview:

This project is for continued development of the ORMMap ArcMap User Group tools. Polk, Deschutes, Lane, and Clackamas Counties will complete the development of additional tools. These tools will be used to improve productivity of conversion by these four counties as well as users at DOR and several other counties. The tool development has been approved by the ArcMap ORMMap tools committee and will be used by all user Counties to regardless of mapping status.

Attachment B

ORMAP Funding Criteria Checklist

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. Questions surfaced concerning the process and criteria for determining grant awards. In response, DOR decided to draft a proposed administrative rule to address these questions with input from both the ORMAP Tech Group and the Advisory Committee. 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.

Funding Process

1. Grant applications sent to DOR are reviewed using the *Administrative Review Criteria* (immediately below) and *ORMAP Policies* (Appendix 1). 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 further review.
2. The technical committee reviews grant applications that pass the *Administrative Review Criteria*. The committee applies the *Technical Review Criteria* (below) 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 ORMAP coordinator.
3. Grant applications that pass both the administrative and the technical committee review are scored by DOR using the Priority Scoring points. Scoring is only required if the grant applications that pass the DOR and tech committee reviews request more funds than are available from the ORMAP 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. 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).

Review Criteria

Administrative Review

Each of these criteria is pass/fail. If the county does not meet the criteria, the county is allowed to make changes prior to it being posted for technical review.

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

2. **Have no more than two outstanding ORMMap "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 ORMMap website.

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

5. **Provide ORMMap, by February 1, with the most 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

Each of these criteria 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 ORMMap 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.

Priority Scoring

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

Technical Rating

County grant proposals that meet all of the ORMMap 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 ORMMap business plan.

3. Completion of a low percentage of tax lots that meet the ORMMap 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 ORMMap 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 ORMMap Goal 6 (100% of county tax maps meeting the technical specifications), it will receive five points.

Policy Rating

1. Multi-county efforts to encourage collaboration – 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 – 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.

5. County has signed a statewide data sharing agreement to share their tax lot data – 2 points

This is in reference to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and the Cadastral Framework Team's (FIT) effort to share county tax lot data with state agencies for limited purposes. By signing this agreement a county would received \$1,000 annually in exchange for making their tax lot data available as part of a statewide tax lot shapefile.

6. Preference points for next funding cycle – 3 points

If a county voluntarily withdraws its grant request or if the grant does not qualify for funding because of a low point total, "preference points" will be awarded in the next funding cycle if the county resubmits its grant request.

Appendix 1:

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 a larger grant (grant requesting 20% or more of available funds) limit the ability of other 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.

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.

Attachment C

2007- 2009 ORMAP Quarterly Fund Balance

revised: 10/15/2008

Quarter Ending	CAFFA Deposits to OLIS (+)	Contract Reversions (+)	Admin Expenses (-)	Net Fund Deposit (=)	Fund Balance	Project Grants	Ending Fund Balance
2007-June	\$287,909.29	\$44,981.00	\$21,218.00	\$311,672.29		\$702,857.00	\$389,899.38
2007-Sept	\$258,925.34	\$156,860.29	\$18,483.00	\$397,302.63	\$787,202.01	\$740,350.00	\$46,852.01
2007-Dec	\$221,806.18	\$14,095.00	\$16,812.00	\$219,089.18	\$265,941.19	\$0.00	\$265,941.19
2008-Mar	\$221,294.05	\$26,614.54	\$27,180.00	\$220,728.59	\$486,669.78	\$17,400.00	\$469,269.78
2008-June	\$234,785.08	\$43,227.00	\$25,721.00	\$252,291.08	\$721,560.86	\$461,295.68	\$260,265.18
2008-Sept	\$194,524.11	\$9,977.30	\$26,000.00	\$178,501.41	\$438,766.59	\$459,104.40	(\$20,337.81)
2008-Dec	\$220,000.00		\$26,000.00	\$194,000.00	\$173,662.19	\$0.00	\$173,662.19
2009-Mar	\$220,000.00		\$26,000.00	\$194,000.00	\$367,662.19	\$0.00	\$367,662.19
2009-June	\$220,000.00		\$26,000.00	\$194,000.00	\$561,662.19	\$784,130.00	(\$222,467.81)
Totals	\$1,791,334.76	\$250,774.13	\$192,196.00	\$1,849,912.89			

italics are an estimated amount

Attachment D

2009 ORMAP Meeting Schedule

Spring 2009

February 20th:

Draft Applications and Updated Online Business Plans Due

February 27th:

Grant Applications Posted for Review

March 5th:

DOR Review of ORMAP Grants

March 19th:

1st Tech Group Meeting

Site: TBD

10 am – 3 pm

March 26th:

Addendums Due to Department of Revenue

April 16th:

2nd Tech Group Meeting

DOR Salem Field Office

10 am – 3 pm

April 27th:

DOR Director's Grant Review/Award

May 14th:

Spring Advisory Committee Meeting

DOR Salem Field Office

10 am – 3 pm

2009 ORMAP Meeting Schedule

Fall 2009

August 14th:

Draft Applications and Updated Online Business Plans Due

August 28th:

Grant Applications Posted for Review

September 10th:

DOR Review of ORMAP Grants

September 17th:

1st Tech Group Meeting

Site: TBD

10 am – 3 pm

September 25th:

Addendums Due to Department of Revenue

October 8th:

2nd Tech Group Meeting

DOR Salem Field Office

10 am – 3 pm

October 19th:

DOR Director's Grant Review/Award

November 5th:

Fall Advisory Committee Meeting

DOR Salem Field Office

10 am – 3 pm

Weighted Grant Reductions

1. Calculate the percentage of total dollars requested by each counties.
2. Calculate the weighted amount by multiplying the number of points by the dollars requested.
3. Determine the percentage of each county's weighted amount to the total number of dollars weighted.
4. Compare the two percentages. Apply the lowest percentage to the actual dollars available.

Amount Available \$438,766

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduction %	Amount Granted	amt req/total avail	Wt. Req \$\$	Wt w/amt	Amount awarded using wt	Fund Running Balance	Difference from amt award
Multnomah	15	60,000	0%	\$60,000	14%	900,000	15%	\$60,000	378,766	\$0
Deschutes	12	64,465	15%	\$54,796	15%	773,580	13%	\$57,889	320,877	\$3,093
Lane	11	70,975	15%	\$60,329	16%	780,725	13%	\$58,424	262,453	(\$1,905)
Josephine	10	20,000	30%	\$14,000	5%	200,000	3%	\$14,967	247,487	\$967
Washington	10	44,470	30%	\$31,129	10%	444,700	8%	\$33,278	214,208	\$2,149
Tillamook	9	48,548	30%	\$33,983	11%	436,932	7%	\$32,697	181,512	(\$1,286)
Clackamas	8	59,480	30%	\$41,636	14%	475,840	8%	\$35,608	145,903	(\$6,028)
Crook	8	48,349	30%	\$33,845	11%	386,792	7%	\$28,945	116,959	(\$4,900)
Klamath	8	75,620	30%	\$52,934	17%	604,960	10%	\$45,271	71,688	(\$7,663)
Coos	7	64,706	50%	\$32,353	15%	452,942	8%	\$33,895	37,793	\$1,542
Yamhill	6	26,000	50%	\$13,000	6%	156,000	3%	\$11,674	26,119	(\$1,326)
Curry	4	45,805	50%	\$22,903	10%	183,220	3%	\$13,711	12,408	(\$9,192)
ArcMap Tools	4	16,900	50%	\$8,450	4%	67,600	1%	\$5,059	7,349	(\$3,391)

Totals 112 \$645,318 \$459,358 5,863,291 100% 431,417

ORMAP Fall 2008 Additional Grant Reductions

10/15/2008

Fall 2008

Amount Available \$438,766

Additional Redcuton of 5% to all grants

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduction %	Amount Granted	Additional Reduction	Difference
Multnomah	15	\$60,000	0%	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$0.00
Deschutes	12	\$64,465	15%	\$54,795.25	\$51,781.51	(\$3,013.74)
Lane	11	\$70,975	15%	\$60,328.75	\$57,010.67	(\$3,318.08)
Josephine	10	\$20,000	30%	\$14,000.00	\$13,230.00	(\$770.00)
Washington	10	\$44,470	30%	\$31,129.00	\$29,416.91	(\$1,712.10)
Tillamook	9	\$48,548	30%	\$33,983.60	\$32,114.50	(\$1,869.10)
Clackamas	8	\$59,480	30%	\$41,636.00	\$39,346.02	(\$2,289.98)
Crook	8	\$48,349	30%	\$33,844.30	\$31,982.86	(\$1,861.44)
Klamath	8	\$75,260	30%	\$52,682.00	\$49,784.49	(\$2,897.51)
Coos	7	\$64,706	50%	\$32,353.00	\$30,573.59	(\$1,779.42)
Yamhill	6	\$26,000	50%	\$13,000.00	\$12,285.00	(\$715.00)
Curry	4	\$45,805	50%	\$22,902.50	\$21,642.86	(\$1,259.64)
ArcMap Tools	4	\$16,900	50%	\$8,450.00	\$7,985.25	(\$464.75)

Totals 112 \$644,958 \$459,104.40 \$437,153.66

Blue highlight is for Fall 2008 Actuals

Fall 2008

Amount Available \$438,766

Additional Reduction of 30% Grants in the Lowest Scoring Quartile

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduction %	Amount Granted	Additional Reduction	Difference
Multnomah	15	60,000	0%	\$60,000	\$60,000.00	\$0.00
Deschutes	12	64,465	15%	\$54,795	\$54,795.25	\$0.00
Lane	11	70,975	15%	\$60,329	\$60,328.75	\$0.00
Josephine	10	20,000	30%	\$14,000	\$14,000.00	\$0.00
Washington	10	44,470	30%	\$31,129	\$31,129.00	\$0.00
Tillamook	9	48,548	30%	\$33,984	\$33,983.60	\$0.00
Clackamas	8	59,480	30%	\$41,636	\$41,636.00	\$0.00
Crook	8	48,349	30%	\$33,844	\$33,844.30	\$0.00
Klamath	8	75,260	30%	\$52,682	\$52,682.00	\$0.00
Coos	7	64,706	50%	\$32,353	\$22,970.63	(\$9,382.37)
Yamhill	6	26,000	50%	\$13,000	\$9,230.00	(\$3,770.00)
Curry	4	45,805	50%	\$22,903	\$16,260.78	(\$6,641.73)
ArcMap Tools	4	16,900	50%	\$8,450	\$5,999.50	(\$2,450.50)

Totals 112 \$644,958 \$459,104 \$436,859.81

Blue highlight is for Fall 2008 Actuals

Additional 8% Reduction to Grants Scoring in the Lower 2/3rds Quartile (10 pts or lower)

Fall 2008

Amount Available \$438,766

Additional Reduction 8%

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduction %	Amount Granted	Additional Reduction	Difference
Multnomah	15	60,000	0%	\$60,000	\$60,000.00	\$0.00
Deschutes	12	64,465	15%	\$54,795	\$54,795.25	\$0.00
Lane	11	70,975	15%	\$60,329	\$60,328.75	\$0.00
Josephine	10	20,000	30%	\$14,000	\$12,880.00	(\$1,120.00)
Washington	10	44,470	30%	\$31,129	\$28,638.68	(\$2,490.32)
Tillamook	9	48,548	30%	\$33,984	\$31,264.91	(\$2,718.69)
Clackamas	8	59,480	30%	\$41,636	\$38,305.12	(\$3,330.88)
Crook	8	48,349	30%	\$33,844	\$31,136.76	(\$2,707.54)
Klamath	8	75,260	30%	\$52,682	\$48,467.44	(\$4,214.56)
Coos	7	64,706	50%	\$32,353	\$29,764.76	(\$2,588.24)
Yamhill	6	26,000	50%	\$13,000	\$11,960.00	(\$1,040.00)
Curry	4	45,805	50%	\$22,903	\$21,070.30	(\$1,832.20)
ArcMap Tools	4	16,900	50%	\$8,450	\$7,774.00	(\$676.00)

Totals 112 \$644,958 \$459,104 \$436,385.97

Blue highlight is for Fall 2008 Actuals

Additional 7% Reduction to all Grants, but no more than 50% (15% and 30%)

Fall 2008

Amount Available \$438,766

Additional Reduction 7%

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduction %	Amount Granted	Additional Reduction	Difference
Multnomah	15	60,000	0%	\$60,000	\$60,000.00	\$0.00
Deschutes	12	64,465	15%	\$54,795	\$51,233.56	(\$3,561.69)
Lane	11	70,975	15%	\$60,329	\$56,407.38	(\$3,921.37)
Josephine	10	20,000	30%	\$14,000	\$13,090.00	(\$910.00)
Washington	10	44,470	30%	\$31,129	\$29,105.62	(\$2,023.39)
Tillamook	9	48,548	30%	\$33,984	\$31,774.67	(\$2,208.93)
Clackamas	8	59,480	30%	\$41,636	\$38,929.66	(\$2,706.34)
Crook	8	48,349	30%	\$33,844	\$31,644.42	(\$2,199.88)
Klamath	8	75,260	30%	\$52,682	\$49,257.67	(\$3,424.33)
Coos	7	64,706	50%	\$32,353	\$32,353.00	\$0.00
Yamhill	6	26,000	50%	\$13,000	\$13,000.00	\$0.00
Curry	4	45,805	50%	\$22,903	\$22,902.50	\$0.00
ArcMap Tools	4	16,900	50%	\$8,450	\$8,450.00	\$0.00

Totals 112 \$644,958 \$459,104 \$438,148.47

Blue highlight is for Fall 2008 Actuals

COUNTY	31-Mar-2008	30-Jun-2008	30-Sep-2008	31-Dec-2008
Baker	\$1,114.35	\$998.45	\$1,104.85	
Benton	\$3,421.28	\$3,925.07	\$3,415.76	
Clackamas	\$22,798.00	\$24,063.00	\$18,889.00	
Clatsop	\$2,508.00	\$3,347.00	\$2,656.00	
Columbia	\$3,109.00	\$3,354.00	\$2,583.00	
Coos	\$3,308.00	\$3,623.00	\$3,409.00	
Crook	\$1,569.54	\$1,806.19	\$1,491.74	
Curry	\$1,499.00	\$1,439.00	\$1,207.00	
Deschutes	\$13,816.00	\$13,645.00	\$11,702.85	
Douglas	\$4,902.00	\$5,765.00	\$4,830.00	
Gilliam	\$120.00	\$171.00	\$90.00	
Grant	\$481.00	\$745.00	\$419.00	
Harney	\$521.00	\$532.00	\$601.00	
Hood River	\$1,135.00	\$1,402.00	\$1,185.00	
Jackson	\$11,521.86	\$12,121.96	\$11,936.04	
Jefferson	\$1,162.00	\$1,241.00	\$971.00	
Josephine	\$5,279.00	\$5,046.00	\$4,673.00	
Klamath	\$4,169.00	\$4,951.54	\$3,861.00	
Lake	\$500.00	\$628.00	\$594.00	
Lane	\$17,254.00	\$18,865.00	\$15,137.00	
Lincoln	\$3,815.00	\$3,891.00	\$3,550.42	
Linn	\$6,497.00	\$6,723.25	\$5,735.75	
Malheur	\$1,233.00	\$1,800.00	\$838.00	
Marion	\$15,602.00	\$16,432.00	\$13,983.00	
Morrow	\$467.00	\$581.00	\$603.00	
Multnomah	\$47,534.00	\$48,041.00	\$38,838.00	
Polk	\$3,883.09	\$4,424.09	\$3,484.00	
Sherman	\$106.00	\$136.00	\$85.00	
Tillamook	\$2,337.00	\$2,432.00	\$2,026.00	
Umatilla	\$2,928.62	\$3,235.00	\$2,857.00	
Union	\$1,075.00	\$1,302.00	\$1,257.00	
Wallowa	\$405.00	\$477.00	\$524.00	
Wasco	\$1,328.00	\$1,526.00	\$1,348.00	
Washington	\$28,135.00	\$30,382.00	\$23,258.00	
Wheeler	\$110.00	\$126.00	\$95.00	
Yamhill	\$5,650.31	\$5,607.53	\$5,285.70	

TOTALS	\$221,294.05	\$234,785.08	\$194,524.11	\$650,603.24
---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------