

Fall 2009 ORMAP Advisory Committee Minutes
November 5, 2009
Oregon Department of Revenue Salem, OR

Attendees: Bob Harmon, Tom Ritchey, Dan Linscheid, Doug Hillpot, Pat Shaw, Tim Khouri, Orrin Frederick

Teleconference Attendees: Brandt Melick, Bob Haas, Tami Baney, Clayton Carter, Larry Hatch, Rich Hobernicht, Anette Spickard

DOR: Phil McClellan, Brett Juul, Linda Blacklock, Jim Bucholz, John Prychun

Gallery: Steve Ganoe, Dean Anderson, Dale Himes, Paul Kauffman

Fund Report – Linda Blacklock (handout)

Linda gave an update of ORMAP deposits, requests, and awards from 2000. In 2007, funds began to drop. Deposits are less than a half of what they typically were. Funds are projected to drop to less than \$500,000 per funding cycle.

Grant Application Review (handout) Phil gave a review of the fall grant applications.

Partnership Update (handout)

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. Throughout its history, ORMAP has partnered with others to bring needed dollars into the program. For this funding cycle, over \$400,000 was listed by counties as extra funding sources.

Those who express an interest in partnerships would also like to have data in return. The department is working with DAS to have data sharing agreements that would give permission to share certain data.

The possibility of obtaining federal stimulus dollars has been discussed with DAS. Many federal projects don't meet technical specifications and have short project duration. Cy Smith will continue to look for opportunities.

I

Whatever data the county sends to us would be what we could share. Name suppression would be taken care of by counties. There is a stipulation within the contract that information suppressed by law will not be distributed.

Discussion:

Orrin: As a recipient of stimulus funding it is very time and project sensitive and difficult to manage.

Tim: Are we able to save money by working together on a regional basis?

Phil: We encourage counties to partner with other counties and many are doing that.

Dean: Through the tech group, we work cooperatively. We work hard not to reinvent the wheel.

Tech Group Recommendations

The tech group has four recommendations in order to make the distribution of dollars more equitable for everyone.

#1- Capping large grants at 20%

Dean: The idea is to make the grants more proportionate. Smaller grants would be able to fall within the limit.

Doug: 2012 is not a hard fast date. Once goal 6 has been met, we could set more goals.

Dean: There is a concern that we have trained staff and ability to fund them.

Jim: Is there any objections to ORMAP capping available funds at 20%?

Brandt: He recommends the cap but after current financial challenges are over, to revisit.

Jim: We can change the proposal so that if a grant request was over a certain amount it would be capped, but if it is under a certain amount then it would not be capped.

Brett: We can come up with some way to build in some flexibility.

Steve: Funding criteria only kicks in if requests are over a certain amount.

Linda: We are capping the grants, not the requests.

Dean: Concern was at tech group was the weighting was done on the 20%.

Jim: DOR will come up with a couple of scenarios and send it out to folks. If anyone objects, let us know.

#2: Provide funding to eligible "small" grant requests (fund any request that meet the pass/fail criteria and that does not exceed the 3% of the projected available funds).

Vote: The group approved this recommendation with no objections.

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

Discussion:

Tim: When the completion date keeps being moved it becomes more difficult for the private sector to rely on ORMAP data. Everyone is aware of the funding gap but perception is there is no accountability.

Jim: The accountability is with the deliverables. There is nothing in the law that says when the remapping is to be completed.

Anette: If we don't have additional funding from ORMAP, there is nowhere else to turn for funding.

Dean: Accountability is there. Private industry may be able to kick in more funds to get the project done. The challenge is to find dollars.

Tim: Accountability is built in on a base line level. We are looking more and more at this data set. Why not a more aggressive approach to get funds from the private sector?

Phil: The data that has already been created may meet your business needs. Many agencies have stated that data meeting the technical specifications is more than they need and the current shapefile data meets their needs. There was not a great response from the private sector. In return for funding, they want ownership information and data information. As stated earlier we are working with the framework folks and the counties to develop data sharing agreements.

Brett: Extending the date would encourage those partnerships and data sharing agreements.

Tom Richey moved to change the completion date.

Dan seconded the motion.

The group voted in favor of the recommendation.

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

The group approved the recommendation.

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 boundaries 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

Discussion:

Phil: A priority is put on the percentage of county boundaries that will be edgematched.

Dean: County lines for a lot of us don't have many tax lots. We will give us incentive to do a county line before city lines.

The group approved the tech group recommendation of distribution of edgematch points.

7. ORMAP Web Site Update (handout)

The ORMAP web site software is aging and ESRI will stop supporting it sometime in the near future. DAS has agreed that it needs to be updated and recommends that we update to ARC GIS server, which has greater capability than the current software. In addition to upgrades there will need to be network and hardware updates. DAS committed to network personnel (GIS technician) and set aside \$20,000 to \$25,000 for upgrading the ORMAP website if ORMAP will match their contribution. We need to go through a procurement process to see what we can get

with that amount of money. A commitment from the advisory committee is necessary to approve a match to the DAS commitment.

Discussion:

Doug: He is supportive of the concept but not with a blank check.

Linda: DAS has committed up to \$25,000 and we have committed staff time.

Brandt: He would like to see criteria and what it will cost to upgrade before commitment is made.

Linda: We have met with DAS. They don't know how much it would cost. Before costs are determined, a group of stakeholders will need to meet with vendors.

Brandt: There is value to having advisory committee members included because of the interest and goals of members.

Steve: We need more specifics before we move forward.

Linda: This is not time sensitive except that the technology will fail. DAS is upgrading their services as we speak. We can table the discussion, do more research, and bring that information back to you.

Doug: He agrees with concept of approving the match with a \$25,000 limit.

Dan: If DAS has committed for this for now today would there be a future opportunity for a 2nd matching amount?

Orrin: He is in favor of coming up with a matching scenario.

Bob: He supports the idea of a criteria driven process. All solutions need to be included.

Doug made a motion to approve the DAS matching funds commitment up to \$25,000 for project to move forward. If the amount is significantly more, the recommendation will come back to the advisory group for approval.

Motion was seconded by Pat.

Brandt requested that an amendment to the motion be to consider the criteria and the services required to support the program.

Doug approved the amendment.

Spring 2010 Meeting:

May 27, 2010

Location: Salem Field Office

Time: 1 pm – 4 pm

The agenda will include membership of the advisory group.

Roundtable:

Phil: Three members have served a 2-year term. If you would like to extend your term or end it, please contact Phil. He will work with AOC to fill seats.

Adjourned 2:33pm