

# Special Tech Group Meeting Agenda

November 20, 2003

Dept. of Revenue Salem Field Office

10:00 – 3:00

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Ed Sipp, IDS; Andrea Westersund, Multnomah County; Gerald Longton, DOR; John Prychun, DOR; Brett Juul, DOR; Teri Gaffney, Tillamook County; Brian Hansberry, Yamhill County; Roger Livingston, Washington County; Keith Massie, Jackson County; Tom Bratenk, Polk County; Maggie Hudny, PacifiCorp; Steve Ganoë, Marion County; Isabel Joslen, DOR; Doug Holdt, DOR; Scott Jackson, DOR; Barbara Mitchell, DOR

**Facilitator:** Doug Holdt

**Introductions** – Doug welcomed all in spite of weather conditions . Reviewed agenda.

## **October 23<sup>rd</sup> Advisory Committee Meeting Review – Isabel Joslen**

■ Isabel Joslen gave a brief review of Advisory Committee meeting . Mike Propes resigned; Pat Shaw, Assessor from Gilliam County will be taking his place in the spring.

Program review – financial reporting, forecast.

Doug reported on the business plan. We will be working on having the business plan on line – Advisory Committee approved funding for this purpose.

The Advisory Committee recommended we take a look at having a good balance of getting work done and focusing on process.

Goal 2 review – Advisory Committee agreed that Goal 2 is still important. They approved funding a special project to counties that have chosen to not reach goal 2 and instead focus on goal 4. This project would bring them to goal 2.

Scott Jackson had a presentation on the assessors map components.

We had one grant review for Polk County with lots of discussion. The Advisory committee expressed their desire to be kept informed on the issues the Tech Group reviews. The Advisory Committee will not be approving the grants, but would still like to be kept informed on the issues. We will develop formal statements regarding differences between regional and discretionary grants. Once the Tech Group reviews grants, they will provide recommendations directly to DOR for the final decision. Elizabeth Harchenko, Director of Department of Revenue will still be approving the grants. The Advisory Committee will be strictly for policy issues.

Agenda items for our April meeting:

1. Program grant update
2. Business Plan update
3. Cy Smith –presentation on data accessibility.
4. Structure of ORMAP – funding, business plan and Goal 2 - 4

Minutes are on the website for both June 19, 2003 and October 23, 2003 Advisory Committee Meetings.

We are working on a link for the website to track – a location to find progress in reaching goals.

Tech Group said it would also be interesting to see totals by calendar year on what we received and what we spent for ORMAP funds—Isabel said she would send out the information to the Tech Group.

It was recognized that the Business plans should help us to give forecasts on what we may see come in and what we will need for future projects.

Counties should look for partnerships as the funds are expected to shrink—ORMAP should not be the only source for funding

## **Grant Review Process**

### **Role of Tech Group - Isabel Joslen**

- Tech Group will continue to approve grants as we currently do now. In addition to the reviewing of the grants the Tech Group will review business plans to look at the whole picture and assure it is an effective approach. Business plans should outline a path to the ORMAP product outlined in the goals. The Tech Group will shoulder more responsibility with this approach but given the contributions they have made DOR and the Advisory Committee are confident entrusting the responsibility to them.

### **Criteria for reviewing ORMAP Business Plans and Applications**

- Deliverables? Does it address the map elements for the assessor, if not, why not and we need to have justification. Do we have clear deliverables? If not, we won't be able to measure success.
- Identify assessor maps components specifically
- At some point we need to take a look at past projects. Look and see how the county performed on their past projects? Successful? Business plans should have all past project in them, but the grants have the most current project. If they used a consultant and it did not work, we will want to make note and take another look at what they are asking for.
- The Business plan needs to be specific regarding the deliverables on the application. The Tech Group does not see results of deliverables and would like to.
- Counties should continually amend the business plan – this is a good reason for having the business plan on line.

### **2004 Grant Application Review**

The important parts of the application document are:

1. Deliverables, break it out so people specifically include those deliverables.
2. Timelines will help see project length. Isabel stated individual grants for projects should not go over one year in length.
3. Costs – Outline these, put grants together that are for the same thing so counties do not have to apply for two grants in order to draw from the same fund.

4. Partnerships and contributions – this is important to see how many other sources of funding are supporting a project.
5. Innovation
6. Prioritizing criteria – leave it in now as opposed to putting in back in later.
7. Identify how a county can ask for help – business plans will help with this issue. Design questions around the different departments involved.
8. Policy considerations – change to item to itself.
9. Control is a deliverable put under #1
10. Invocations under partnerships and contributions

- a. Goals 2-4
- b. Benefits to users
- c. County/Regional strategy
- d. Promotes partnership

6. Performance – past project successes

**Action:** Will get changes made and sent out to Tech Group.

Role of ORMAP Tech Group  
Criteria for reviewing grant applications

Criteria for reviewing ORMAP business plans

Plans are to serve a purpose and we will phrase the questions to meet that objective. Is the business plan just for ORMAP or do we include the assessors business? Which approach are we going for or what kind of strategy? direction?

### **Business Plan Approval Process**

Important questions are- Is it current? Is it complete? Your business plan should be consistent with your region. There might be a possibility that the regions will approve the plans. Doug will visit counties to help them put together their business plans. Doug also plans to visit regional user groups to be available for ORMAP questions.

It is not the responsibility of the Tech Group to approve the business plan. The most important issue is they have an updated business plan from each of the counties.

Timeline needs to be updated and it will not be acceptable to DOR that the plan stays the same.

Approving will be measured by if they are current or not.

### **Grant Application Review Process and Timeline**

Business plan and grant applications due the same time. Move forward to March 4<sup>th</sup> in spring and September 2<sup>nd</sup> in the fall.

Spring Tech Group will be held in Salem and the Fall Tech Group meeting will be held in a remote location, possibly The Dalles

A recommendation was made that we have the first meeting in the rural area, due to the time of year and the harsh weather and they would like to see on line communication.

**Action:** Doug will stick with his calendar and 2004 ORMMap meeting schedule. He will send meeting dates out to everyone and also post them on the website.

### **Complete ORMMap Program Improvements Task List – Doug Holdt chart Identify areas for improvement**

Data access issue is not a Tech Group decision? What will the data access policy be? Suggestion that it will need a committee to solve this question. Is this a place for us to discuss? OGIC has not been active with the counties.

Come up with recommendation for tiers. Public access tier 1, ORMMap access tier 2, local government tier 3. Stick with counties access policies for now.

**ACTION:** Develop draft policies – frame issues – sub committee  
Possible committee: Steve Gano, Dean Anderson, Keith Massie, Terri Gaffney, Roger Livingston and maybe Tycho.

Measuring Goal Completion – survey collection and project knowledge – Doug – ongoing- post on the website.

Tech Group Process – make it easy for people to vote by website for the business plans and the grants – one vote per county. This may increase participation by rural counties.

Go through another cycle – defer – business plan refinement until online plan is up so we don't have to redo work.

ORMMap Contracts - Doug will post on the web.

ORMMap Allowances – no money updates needed. Hardware and software grants on the list are now automatic.

Website

- Identify group or individual who will take on each task
- Identify schedule for completing improvements
- Discuss site with end users to get input

**Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**