

Fall 2009 ORMAP Advisory Committee Agenda  
Department of Revenue Building Room 467  
Salem Oregon

November 5, 2009, 1 pm – 4 pm

Conference call: 877-214-5010 conference code: 174341

Web Meeting: [www.webmeeting.att.com](http://www.webmeeting.att.com)

Meeting number: 877-214-5010 participant code: 174341

**1. Introductions**

**2. Fund Report** (see attached)

**3. Grant Application Review** (see attached)

**4. Partnerships** (see attached)

**5. Tech Group Recommendations** (see attached)

**6. Fall 2009 Funding Criteria Changes**

Edge matching Percentages – Members of the tech group asked to make changes to the percentages currently used to determine the points for edgematching. Last cycle the tech group suggested using linear miles or percentage of total county boundary that would be edge matched. The county is required to disclose the percentage of county boundary that would be completed by the project to receive a range of points (based on percentage). The percentages for awarding points will be changed to the following as well.

1% - 10%	=	1 point
11% - 20%	=	3 points
over 20%	=	5 points

**7. ORMAP Web Site Update** (see attached)

**8. Spring 2010 Meeting:**

**May 27, 2010**

**Location: Salem Field Office**

**Time: 1 pm – 4 pm**

## 2009- 2011 ORMAP Quarterly Fund Balance

Quarter Ending	Deposits to OLIS (+)	Contract Reversions (+)	Tools Group (3%)	Admin Expenses (-)	Net Fund Deposit (=)	Fund Balance	Project Grants	Ending Fund Balance
2009-June	\$ 229,708.86	\$ 1,088.59	\$ 6,891.27	\$ 26,399.00	\$ 197,507.18	\$ 655,955.85	\$ 458,451.00	\$ 197,504.85
2009-Sept	\$ 215,106.00	\$ 7,868.00	\$ 6,453.18	\$ 26,500.00	\$ 190,020.82	\$ 387,525.67	\$ -	\$ 387,525.67
2009-Dec	\$ 187,936.00	\$ -	\$ 5,638.08	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 162,936.00	\$ 550,461.67	\$ 387,413.00	\$ 163,048.67
2010-Mar	\$ 188,878.00	\$ -	\$ 5,666.34	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 163,878.00	\$ 326,926.67	\$ -	\$ 326,926.67
2010-June	\$ 202,130.00	\$ -	\$ 6,063.90	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 177,130.00	\$ 504,056.67	\$ 721,736.00	\$ (217,679.33)
2010-Sept	\$ 220,151.00	\$ -	\$ 6,604.53	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 195,151.00	\$ (22,528.33)	\$ -	\$ (22,528.33)
2010-Dec	\$ 236,626.00	\$ -	\$ 7,098.78	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 211,626.00	\$ 189,097.67	\$ 698,147.00	\$ (509,049.33)
2011-Mar	\$ 243,863.00	\$ -	\$ 7,315.89	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 218,863.00	\$ (290,186.33)	\$ -	\$ (290,186.33)
2011-June	\$ 250,809.00	\$ -	\$ 7,524.27	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 225,809.00	\$ (64,377.33)	\$ 703,293.00	\$ (767,670.33)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 1,745,499.00</b>	<b>\$ 7,868.00</b>		<b>\$ 201,500.00</b>	<b>\$ 1,545,413.82</b>			

*Italics* are an estimated amount

Project Grants are based on current ORMAP business plans

Deposits are based on department projections from April 2009. OLIS receives 11% of the total recording fees collected

Tools Group is 3% of deposit.

## Fall 2009 ORMAP Grant Applications Review

### **Benton County**

Outstanding Funds: \$33,652

Requested Funds: \$63,176

#### Grant Summary:

The intent of this project is to re-map Rural Residential areas and some Farm areas between and surrounding the Cities of Albany, Corvallis, and Adair Village. This data would be adjacent to ORMAP format data created in previous projects. Some Survey-grade GPS control would be collected in addition to some existing control.

### **Clackamas County**

Outstanding Funds: \$42,533

Requested Funds: \$20,500

#### Grant Summary:

This project is a continuation of Clackamas County's ORMAP Business Plan. The funds requested for this period will be used to digitally capture, rectify, and prepare for map production approximately 2,000 rural tax lots as defined under ORMAP.

### **Coos County**

Outstanding Funds: \$0

Requested Funds: \$89,119

#### Grant Summary:

Coos County is requesting \$89,119 to begin Phase 10 in Project Area #3. Phase 10 will focus on having our vendor COGO 4,260 parcels (238 maps) at a cost of \$20.92 per parcel. The area consisting of 4,260 parcels along the boundary with Douglas County was selected to convert as the next 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 tenth 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 4,260 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**

Outstanding Funds: \$14,603

Requested Funds: \$99,125

#### Grant Summary:

Crook County is seeking funds to continue the remapping project of the County according to the on-line business plan. This funding cycle, we would like to obtain funds to start Phase 5 of our remapping plan, which will remap 3,008 tax lots comprising 108 tax maps, to ORMAP technical specifications.

These tax maps are located in the western part of the County along the Deschutes border in townships 15s14e and 16s14e; located in the western part of the County along the Jefferson

border in township 13s15e; located south and east of Prineville in 16s15e, 16s17e, and 15s17e. The tax lots are approved for maintenance by DOR and will be added to the DOR-CISU geo-database. This request will cover project-planning, data gathering, control point acquisition, COGO, control base assembly, line-work, text entry, QC, format conversion and delivery for the areas listed in B.3. This project will meet all Cadastral Data Exchange Standards. See B.7 for details.

This is an area of the County that has seen growth in recent years with one Destination Resort currently being developed and two more ready for development. It also shares the boundary with Deschutes and Jefferson Counties. The area south of Prineville comprises parts of Juniper canyon, which together with Prineville and Powell Butte, make up the majority of the population base for Crook County.

### **Curry County**

Outstanding Funds: \$20,216

Requested Funds: \$34,875

#### Grant Summary:

In 2008-09, Curry County budgeted over \$100,000 for Enterprise GIS operations not including an amount, which may be granted as a result of this request. Part of this amount is contributions from our enterprise partners 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 35s15w, 35s14w, 34s15w, 34s14w, 33s14w, 32s14w, 31s16w, and 32s16w, which will bring Curry County up to ORMAP Goal 5 standard (95% of tax maps meeting technical specifications). The Project will meet ORMAP Technical Specifications and the Cadastral Data Exchange Standards.

### **Deschutes County**

Outstanding Funds: \$43,735

Requested Funds: \$41,013

#### Grant Summary:

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. Remapping activities are performed by the Assessors Office working in collaboration with other County GIS staff.

### **Harney County**

Outstanding Funds: \$10,916

Requested Funds: \$87,787

#### Grant Summary:

Harney County is requesting \$82,786 to re-map 4 townships that do not meet current ORMAP accuracy standards. This Phase will focus on having our vendor COGO 1,914 parcels at a cost of \$22.25 per parcel in T23SR30E, T23SR26E, T23SR27E and T32SR32E. It also includes collecting 67 survey control points in 53 maps in T23S R30E at an average cost of \$600 per point.

The Contractor will use an ArcMap, ESRI format and the completed data will be returned in the same data structure/format as sent off by Harney County.

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 1,914 parcels will meet the ORMAP Technical Specifications. Assessment will contribute the in-kind match of one Cartographer's time to check the Contractor's work.

The Burns District BLM and Harney County have a long-term data-sharing/cooperative GIS agreement. One of the foundations of the agreement was that the Harney County tax lots were snapped to BLM's GCDB points. In order to maintain that coincidence, the surveys and remapping of the tax lots must lead to an update of the BLM's GCDB locations.

### **Jackson County**

Outstanding Funds: \$0

Requested Funds: \$65,140

#### Grant Summary:

This is a continuation of the Jackson County ORMAP grant submitted in the Spring of 2009. Said contract #2304 has been completed timely and is in the process of being billed.

This project is dedicated to digitally remapping the Jackson County tax lot base in multiple areas across the county (please see attached map list) where the current tax lot base does not meet ORMAP Technical Specifications. Jackson County proposes to utilize ORMAP funds to improve the spatial accuracy of the tax lot base to meet technical specifications and data exchange standards.

One cartographer's sole responsibility is to convert Assessment maps to these specifications, and this grant request continues funding for this position for one more year. Since it takes approximately eight months to a year to fully train a cartographer to be capable in this capacity, without ORMAP funding, our remapping to goal 6 would be set back accordingly.

The Jackson/Josephine County border has already been edgematched. Jackson County will edge match with Douglas and Klamath Counties for this funding cycle. The funded cartographer position will also convert approximately 50 maps this next year. In addition, three other cartographers will be converting approximately 50 additional Assessment maps this year. By converting approximately 100 maps this next year, and edgematching the two remaining county borders, Jackson County expects to have all of our Assessment maps converted by 2012

### **Josephine County**

Outstanding Funds: \$27,141

Requested Funds: \$47,014

#### Grant Summary:

Completion of Spring 2009 grant that was reduced. 1,064 tax lots would be converted in 36S 5W which would complete the township. Also continue Fall 2008 grant which collects control points in 36S 6W. This grant would relate to the COGO/control work required before tax lot conversion of 2,400 tax lots (The Control Phase, steps 3a and 3b of attached mapping methodology).

### **Klamath County**

Outstanding Funds: \$22,618  
Requested Funds: \$3,795

Grant Summary:

This request is for funding to complete mapping phase 4 (see Attachment 1) of Klamath County. This phase is the fourth phase of a approximately 12 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**

Outstanding Funds: \$60,831  
Requested Funds: \$46,204

Grant Summary:

Lane County's Spring 2009 Cycle Request was for \$140,000.00. Our award was reduced to \$58,796.00, or 42%. We reduced the deliverables proportionately and applied the funding to support 84% one A&T Cartographer 7/1/2009 and 6/30/2010.

This Fall 2009 Cycle request seek to make up the unfunded 16% of the A&T Cartographer and provide funding for one Public Works Cartographer for the second half of the fiscal year 2009-2010.

Specifically, this request is for:

\$ 11,204.00 to make up for the portion of the A&T FTE not received

\$ 35,000.00 to fund PMP for the last 6 months of FY 09-10

-----  
\$ 46,204.00 total

This request seeks to continue the Lane County Assessor map conversion effort with the same intensity and strategy that has been successful since our Fall 05 Request (Contract 1534). At Public Works a GIS Tech will create annotation and reference features for 300 maps. At A&T, staff will create features for another 250 maps and a Cadastral Cartographer will finish and approve all 550 deliverable maps.

This project follows our ORMAP business plan, and works in a regional GIS context.

**Lincoln County**

Outstanding Funds: \$36,397  
Requested Funds: \$23,603

Grant Summary:

This project will provide control to test and refine COGO'ed Assessor maps that are not yet certified to meet ORMAP accuracy standards. The ORMAP accuracy standards can not be met without additional GPS control. This grant will fund a temporary Survey Technician 2 who will be working out of the County Surveyor's office. The vast majority of points to be collected will be on maps that have been designated as "urban". The results of this project will be used to determine how much each map will need to be reworked in order to meet ORMAP accuracy standards. These GPS positions will be collected throughout the county in areas identified by the problem maps.

The money asked for in this grant represents the remainder of what was requested in the original grant request in Spring 2009.

### **Morrow County**

Outstanding Funds: \$33,298

Requested Funds: \$93,420

#### Grant Summary:

We had anticipated requesting funds for Phase 2 of our remapping project. However, with the reduction in grants from the Spring Cycle, we are also asking for the funds necessary to complete Phase 1. Our request is to cover project planning, data gathering, COGO, control base assembly, line-work, text entry, quality control, format conversion and delivery. This request will also cover control points for Phase 3. We had originally planned on gathering 80 points per phase and have reduced that number to 50.

### **Wallowa County**

Outstanding Funds: \$0

Requested Funds: \$40,696

#### Grant Summary:

Wallowa County is seeking funding for a mapping project covering 1178 tax lots in townships 6N39E through 6N47E, 5N39E through 5N48E, 1S41E through 1S43E, 2S41E through 2S43E, 3S42E, 3S43E, 4S42E and 4S43E referred to as *Phase 1(Pilot)*. The tax lots 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 tax maps and # of tax lots to be included in Phase 1. 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. This request will also cover additional control points needed in the Phase 1 pilot area.

### **Washington County**

Outstanding Funds: \$90,365

Requested Funds: \$228,660

#### Grant Summary:

This project will fund 2 GIS interns, 1 FTE Cartographer, Cartography OT and ESU Line work. 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**

Outstanding Funds: \$11,200

Requested Funds: \$51,000

#### Grant Summary:

Remapping and conversion of 3,000 taxlots on 148 taxmaps to ORMAP Technical Specifications. The taxlots and maps are located in townships 3s5w, 4s5w, 5s6w, and 5s7w.

## Partnership Update

The advisory committee requested at the spring 2009 meeting that the department look for funding partnerships for the ORMAP program to help offset the decrease in fund deposits. Over the past 10 years, since ORMAP's inception, it has strived to develop partnerships. We have developed some very lasting partnerships that has helped ORMAP and the counties get to the point they are today. These partnerships are on many different levels; providing matching funds, cash, or in-kind support and data.

The partnerships have come from different sources; cities within the county, rural fire districts, county surveyors, public works and engineering departments, and the county assessor's office. We have also developed partnerships with utility companies, such as; Idaho Power, Portland General Electric, and Bonneville Power.

We also use resources from other government agencies, such as; ODOT, BLM, State Lands, State Parks, and Forestry. We will continue to explore partnerships with other state, county, and city agencies in an attempt to secure in-kind contributions that will help the remapping process.

The fall 2009 funding cycle counties list over \$420,000 in contributions from other sources.

Clackamas County	\$55,000	Klamath County	\$750
Coos County	\$42,960	Lane County	\$106,920
Crook County	\$94,988	Lincoln County	\$36,688
Curry County	\$25,353	Morrow County	\$15,000
Deschutes County	\$40,000	Wallowa County	\$6,000
Harney County	\$10,768	Washington County	\$22,800
Jackson County	\$1,100		

I have also spoken with PGE and they expressed a willingness to provide control or GIS data in areas they maintain along county boundaries. In exchange for access to the final tax lot data. We spoke with Cy Smith, at DAS GEO, about the availability of federal stimulus dollars for the use in GIS and parcel data. Cy was not aware of any current projects that could be use for remapping parcels by ORMAP. He said that his staff look into future stimulus projects that ORMAP could possibly tap into.

Many of the federal projects would require a short turn around time, many counties have stated that even with a large influx of cash they don't have the trained staff. Also the data developed by these projects may not meet the technical specifications outline by ORMAP and would require the final product to be available to the public.

Groups outside of state agencies that expressed an interest in working with the counties and the department as partners have asked for the same thing in return, data. Most notably the ownership data. The department is currently working with Framework Implementation Team (FIT) at DAS GEO to make this data accessible. Currently there are 17 counties that have signed the statewide data sharing agreement. This allows the sharing of the GIS data, including the ownership information, with state agencies only. We hope to add more counties in the coming months and work with them to provide this data to everyone in the future.

## Fall 2009 Tech Group Recommendations

The Fall 2009 ORMMap Tech Group met on September 17 and October 20, 2009, to review the fall grant requests as well as to talk through other ORMMap issues. Due to the continual decline in ORMMap funds to be distributed, the counties are now facing large reductions in the amount of ORMMap dollars they receive. Continued decline in ORMMap funds, other counties' budgetary issues, and the ORMMap Goal 6, 2012 completion date have combined to create some unintended consequences for participants in the program. The majority of the participants present indicated that they will NOT be able to meet the 2012 targeted completion date. At least one other county has requested about 59% of the ORMMap funds available in order to meet the 2012 date. If approved, these large dollar grant requests skew the ranking and rating criteria and other counties' requests suffer further if one county is allowed to be given 1/3 of total funds available.

For the reason listed above, the Tech Group is making four recommendations to the Advisory Committee 1.) Allow no grant awards to exceed 20% of the total estimated funds, 2.) Fund any eligible grants that do not exceed 3% of the estimated funds available, 3.) Move the Goal 6 target date from 2012 to 2016, 4) Make the recommended changes effective for the current fall funding cycle.

### **Recommendation #1 - Capping large grants at 20%.**

**Details:** The tech group felt that capping grants at 20% of the projected available funds would keep the weighting process from getting skewed by very large grants. Current practice is to approve all requests that meet the requirement outlined for receiving these grants. This policy worked very well when there were enough ORMMap dollars to fund all the requests. Now that there aren't enough dollars, counties are struggling to find the resources to complete their projects. Therefore, the tech group would like some acknowledgement that in order to share what funds are available there needs to be some limitation on the amount of funds given to any one county. The tech group attendees and those that had responded by e-mail are in general agreement that capping the grant awards at 20% of the estimated/projected funds available will result in a much more equitable distribution of the actual funds.

#### **Pros:**

- This would keep grant requests larger than 20% from skewing the weighting process and thus would allow for a more uniform distribution of funds.
- Although there would still be reductions to the grants, those reduction percentages would be less.
- In cases where there are matching funds/resources to be had, less reductions to the grant would allow counties to secure greater funding from other sources.
- Would allow counties to continue with moderate sized projects.

#### **Cons:**

- Counties that were requesting the total amount required to be completed by 2012 may not receive enough funds to meet that completion date if their request is capped.

**Department Recommendation: The Department agrees that it would be good for the ORMMap program to put a cap of 20% of the forecasted fund on ORMMap requested funds.**

**Recommendation #2. Provide funding to eligible “small” grant requests (fund any request that meets the pass/fail criteria and that does not exceed the 3% of the projected available funds)**

**Details:** The tech group displayed shared concerns about the lack of ORMAP funding for small grant requests. In the past, small grant requests have been treated the same as any other request. Due to the decline in ORMAP funds, the grants are getting reduced significantly in the funding criteria process. In many cases, small grant requests are being reduced to the point where it is not feasible to complete any work. It is this unintended consequence that this recommendation is looking to address. It is recommended that grants requesting 3%, or less, of the projected available funds be awarded full funding before the weighting processes.

**Pros:**

- This would allow counties to be assured of funding for smaller remapping projects. The additional dollars may assist in finding and securing additional funding from other sources.
- Would keep smaller projects from being reduced to the point where they no longer become feasible, thus keeping the ORMAP project alive and moving.

**Example:** From the attached spreadsheets in both the spring and fall 2009 funding cycle, small grants were reduced to the point where they are not feasible to complete. See spring 2009 Wallowa County and fall 2009 Klamath County.

**Cons:**

- These grants would be fully funded first and would reduce the overall amount available.

**Department Recommendation:** The Department agrees that smaller grants should not be subject to the weighting criteria but should be fully funded.

**Recommendation #3. Move the ORMAP Goal 6 Target Completion Date to 2016.**

**Details:** The tech group expressed concerns with meeting the current goal 6 date of 2012. Reduced ORMAP dollars, county resources, and uncertain contributions from other partners have made it difficult, if not impossible in some cases, to achieve the statewide goal. Most tech group attendees agreed that they would not be able to meet the current 2012 date without a large amount of additional funding.

**Pros:**

- Would allow counties to apply for more moderate grant requests, allowing for better disbursement of funds while still on track to meet the new completion date of 2016.
- Allow time for the economic climate to recover.
- Ease the pressure on the ORMAP fund as a result of counties trying to complete remapping projects by 2012.
- Give the counties more opportunity to develop partnerships.
- Much of the data that is already being produced meets the needs of other agencies.

**Cons:**

- Remapping to the ORMAP technical specifications would not be completed by 2012.
- 100% of the state’s tax maps would not meet ORMAP technical specifications until 2016.

**Department Recommendation:** The department agrees with the concept of moving the ORMAP Goal 6 completion date to 2016. Moving this date may ultimately affect when the remapping is completed, but with the counties facing difficult budgetary times, it is highly unlikely that the 2012 completion date goal is going to be met by all counties anyway. It seems like a reasonable solution to allow those who need to 2016 to complete their project and who are willing to make grant requests with that completion date in mind, to allow this request.

**Recommendation #4. Make the recommended changes effective for the current fall funding cycle.**

**Conclusion:**

If the Tech Group's recommendations are accepted, the new process would include:

- a. The department announcing what dollar amounts would be accepted for grant request at the beginning of the funding cycle. This would be based on the department's projected deposits and fund balance.
- b. Counties would submit their grant applications based on these projections to the department by the specified date.
- c. Small grants that meet all of the pass/fail criteria would be fully funded, reducing the total available funds. Grants could not be adjusted once the actual deposit amounts are known. But weighting and reductions would use the actual dollars.
- d. All other grants would then be subject the funding criteria, weighting process, and reduction if needed.

**Examples:** See attached spreadsheets showing the reductions with both the small grants and the large grant caps.



Spring 2009

## ORMAP Funding Criteria Weighted Reductions with Caps

Amount Available

after small grants     \$ 450,528  
 Small Grant (3%)     \$ 13,753  
 Lager Grants (20%)   \$ 91,690

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduced \$\$	Reduction Percentage	amt req/total avail	Weighted \$\$	Weighted %	Amount awarded using wt
Marion	14	\$ 60,000	\$ 16,731	28%	13%	\$ 840,000	10%	\$43,269
Polk	13	\$ 67,000	\$ 22,134	33%	15%	\$ 871,000	10%	\$44,866
Lincoln	13	\$ 60,000	\$ 19,821	33%	13%	\$ 780,000	9%	\$40,179
Benton	11	\$ 65,560	\$ 28,412	43%	15%	\$ 721,160	8%	\$37,148
Josephine	10	\$ 31,049	\$ 15,055	48%	7%	\$ 310,490	4%	\$15,994
Clackamas	9	\$ 35,000	\$ 18,774	54%	8%	\$ 315,000	4%	\$16,226
Lane	9	\$ 91,690	\$ 49,182	54%	20%	\$ 825,210	9%	\$42,508
Tillamook	9	\$ 51,752	\$ 27,760	54%	11%	\$ 465,768	5%	\$23,992
Klamath	8	\$ 57,678	\$ 33,909	59%	13%	\$ 461,424	5%	\$23,769
Morrow	8	\$ 91,690	\$ 53,905	59%	20%	\$ 733,520	8%	\$37,785
Washington	8	\$ 91,690	\$ 53,905	59%	20%	\$ 733,520	8%	\$37,785
Coos	7	\$ 89,705	\$ 57,359	64%	20%	\$ 627,935	7%	\$32,346
Jackson	7	\$ 60,000	\$ 38,365	64%	13%	\$ 420,000	5%	\$21,635
Crook	7	\$ 57,312	\$ 36,647	64%	13%	\$ 401,184	5%	\$20,665
Yamhill	6	\$ 40,000	\$ 28,800	72%	9%	\$ 240,000	3%	\$11,200

Totals                           139           \$ 950,126   \$ 500,761   \$ 8,746,211           100%   449,365

**Small Grants Funded**

Wallowa   \$ 7,920

**Weighted \$\$ = Points x Amt Requested**

**Weighted % = Weighted \$\$/Total of weighted dollars**

FUNDING CYCLE Fall 2009 - Updated

ORMAP Funding Criteria Weighted Reductions

Tools Group \$ 6,449  
 Amount Available \$ 387,525

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduced \$\$	Reduction Percentage	amt req/total avail	Weighted \$\$	Weighted %	Amount awarded using wt
Clackamas	14	\$ 20,500	\$ 9,926	48%	5%	287,000	3%	\$10,574
Jackson	14	\$ 65,140	\$ 31,540	48%	17%	911,960	9%	\$33,600
Lincoln	13	\$ 23,603	\$ 12,298	52%	6%	306,839	3%	\$11,305
Crook	12	\$ 99,125	\$ 55,300	56%	26%	1,189,500	11%	\$43,825
Benton	11	\$ 63,176	\$ 37,572	59%	16%	694,936	7%	\$25,604
Klamath	11	\$ 3,795	\$ 2,257	59%	1%	41,745	0%	\$1,538
Washington	11	\$ 228,660	\$ 135,989	59%	59%	2,515,260	24%	\$92,671
Coos	10	\$ 89,119	\$ 56,285	63%	23%	891,190	8%	\$32,834
Deschutes	9	\$ 41,013	\$ 27,414	67%	11%	369,117	4%	\$13,599
Harney	9	\$ 87,787	\$ 58,678	67%	23%	790,083	8%	\$29,109
Josephine	9	\$ 47,014	\$ 31,425	67%	12%	423,126	4%	\$15,589
Lane	9	\$ 46,204	\$ 30,883	67%	12%	415,836	4%	\$15,321
Morrow	9	\$ 93,420	\$ 62,443	67%	24%	840,780	8%	\$30,977
Wallowa	8	\$ 40,696	\$ 28,701	71%	11%	325,568	3%	\$11,995
Curry	6	\$ 34,875	\$ 27,166	78%	9%	209,250	2%	\$7,709
Yamhill	6	\$ 51,000	\$ 39,726	78%	13%	306,000	3%	\$11,274

Totals 161 \$1,035,127 10,518,190 100% 387,525

**Weighted \$\$ = Points x Amt Requested**

**Weighted % = Weighted \$\$/Total of weighted dollars**

## ORMAP Funding Criteria Weighted Reductions with Caps

FUNDING CYCLE Fall 2009 - Updated

Amount available

after small grants \$ 383,730

Small Grant (3%) \$ 11,626

Large Grant (20%) \$ 77,505

County	Points	Amount Requested	Reduced \$\$	Reduction Percentage	amt req/total avail	Weighted \$\$	Weighted %	Amount awarded using wt
Clackamas	14	\$ 20,500	\$ 5,999	29%	5%	287,000	4%	\$14,501
Jackson	14	\$ 65,140	\$ 19,063	29%	17%	911,960	12%	\$46,077
Lincoln	13	\$ 23,603	\$ 8,100	34%	6%	306,839	4%	\$15,503
Crook	12	\$ 77,505	\$ 30,513	39%	20%	930,060	12%	\$46,992
Benton	11	\$ 63,176	\$ 28,064	44%	16%	694,936	9%	\$35,112
Washington	11	\$ 77,505	\$ 34,429	44%	20%	852,555	11%	\$43,076
Coos	10	\$ 16,746	\$ 8,285	49%	4%	167,460	2%	\$8,461
Deschutes	9	\$ 41,013	\$ 22,363	55%	11%	369,117	5%	\$18,650
Harney	9	\$ 77,505	\$ 42,261	55%	20%	697,545	9%	\$35,244
Josephine	9	\$ 47,014	\$ 25,635	55%	12%	423,126	6%	\$21,379
Lane	9	\$ 46,204	\$ 25,194	55%	12%	415,836	5%	\$21,010
Morrow	9	\$ 77,505	\$ 42,261	55%	20%	697,545	9%	\$35,244
Wallowa	8	\$ 40,696	\$ 24,247	60%	11%	325,568	4%	\$16,449
Curry	6	\$ 34,875	\$ 24,303	70%	9%	209,250	3%	\$10,572
Yamhill	6	\$ 51,000	\$ 35,539	70%	13%	306,000	4%	\$15,461

Totals 150 \$ 759,987 7,594,797 100% 383,730

### Small Grants Funded

Klamath \$ 3,795

**Weighted \$\$ = Points x Amt Requested**

**Weighted % = Weighted \$\$/Total of weighted dollars**

## **ORMAP Website Update**

Last spring we discussed the ORMAP web site and its software upgrades. We have been in discussion with the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and the department's IT department about upgrading the web site's current software. Currently the site is based on ArcIMS, ESRI is going to stop its support of this software. We are currently looking to upgrade to ArcGIS Server. This upgrade will require a rewrite of the current code used for the site. DAS has offered resources to aid in the transition.

By upgrading the ORMAP site to ArcGIS Server we would be able to provide web services and data to other county web sites as well as consume services from their sites. Some of these services would be the possibility of providing the statewide shapefile, currently in use on the ORMAP site, to the counties and other state agencies. As well as, receiving regular updates of tax lot shapefiles and daily map updates by providing a direct link for the maps to the county websites. We could also provide air photos and road data as a background on the ORMAP site from DAS and ODOT.

After speaking further with DAS it was suggested that we would use an outside contractor to make the base changes to the ORMAP site. With the aid of department and DAS staff, this would provide our staff that opportunity to be trained on the changes so we can continue to provide web maintenance and future modifications. It was also pointed out that our current hardware and network architecture would need to be upgraded as well to support the changes. We discussed options for these changes as well. One of them was to partner with DAS during their hardware upgrades and work in conjunction with them to offset the costs. DAS said they have set aside \$20-\$25K for this process. With ORMAP providing some level of matching funds.

DAS would assist ORMAP and the department in developing a scope of work for the RFP and soliciting bids from a number of contractors. ORMAP is working with the department's web services division to identify staff and resources that would assist in the process.

Another option would be to leave the site as it is and continue to use the software and data. The problem with this is the longer we wait the further behind we get with software updates and run the risk of a problem without software support.