

Spring 2008 ORMAP Tech Group Meeting Agenda
March 6, 2008 10 am – 3 pm
Dept. of Revenue Field Office
Salem, OR

1. Introductions

2. Review of Spring 2008 ORMAP Grant Applications

In order to get through the all the grants please try to keep comments to 15 minutes per grant.

Reminder about “total cost of project”: this is the total cost of the project, and is to include any county contributions or other funding sources.

A. Clatsop County: Krysta Hess

This project focuses on one township – T8N10W - and will produce 4,507 taxlots. Will this work involve creating the features that are needed to produce a complete map for this township? If so, how many maps?

3. ORMAP Funding Criteria (See Attachment)

Current Fund Balance:	\$257,491
Est. March '08 Deposit:	\$248,000
Total	\$505,491
Spring 08 Grants:	\$692,527
Difference:	\$-187,036

4. 2008 ORMAP ‘Goal 2’ Shapefile

Bold Counties have not submitted a shapefile as of 3/3/08.

Baker	Benton	Clackamas	Clatsop	Columbia	Coos
Crook	Curry	Deschutes	Douglas	Gilliam	Grant
Harney	Hood River	Jackson	Jefferson	Josephine	Klamath
Lake	Lane	Lincoln	Linn	Malheur	Marion
Morrow	Multnomah	Polk	Sherman	Tillamook	Umatilla
Union	Wallowa	Wasco	Washington	Wheeler	Yamhill

5. Update of “Technical Specifications Testing Tool”

Dean Anderson – Polk County

6. Minimum Data Requirements for ORMAP Funded Control

*This was a item from the 2nd fall 2007 tech group meeting minutes. I was not sure if we had come to a decision on this or not. Hopefully, we can close the books on this one and get a final document out.

X - coordinate
Y - coordinate
Latitude (i.e. degrees/min/secs)
Longitude (i.e. degrees/min/secs)

Township (should north and south be a separate field?)
Range (should east and west be a separate field?)
Units (e.g. survey feet, international feet, or meters)
Datum (e.g. NAD27 or NAD83-91)
Projection (e.g. State Plan North or South (w/ year))
Date Collected
Name of Point
Reliability of Coordinate (+/- feet)

Information on the methodology and equipment used to establish position values. (Developing a pick list for this is somewhat difficult but it could be something like - Survey grade GPS, Sub-Meter GPS, Uncorrected GPS, Survey traverse, Other, etc.

Standardizing the data with pick lists makes it much more usable. Another option is simply to require all of the information in a standard format. For example, ORMAP could require all X and Y positions be reported in the HARN datum in International Feet. Other fields could also be standardized.

Lunch

7. FIT Update and Data Sharing/Data Subscription

Cress Bates – Cadastral Fit Chair

8. Future Agenda Items

9. Goal 1 Updates Due

10. 2nd Spring 2008 ORMAP Tech Group Meeting

March 27, 2007
DOR Salem Field Office
10 am – 3 pm

11. Adjournment

COUNTY	Outstanding Grant Amounts	Reverted Funds	Spring 2008	
			Grant Application	Hardware/Software
Baker	\$0.00	\$16,438.52		
Benton	\$50,000.00	\$8,200.00	\$52,400.00	
Clackamas	\$87,228.00	\$5,600.00	\$25,000.00	
Clatsop	\$9,600.00	\$8,203.15	\$10,757.00	
Columbia	\$61,989.27	\$26,534.61		
Coos	\$67,099.94	\$699.02	\$81,640.00	
Crook	\$129,015.00	\$675.00		
Curry	\$43,227.00	\$53,958.35		
Deschutes	\$49,627.19	\$25,664.05	\$11,276.00	
Douglas	\$0.00	\$57,300.77		
Gilliam	\$0.00	\$979.59		
Grant	\$0.00	\$9,631.50		
Harney	\$0.00		\$49,247.00	
Hood River	\$0.00	\$4,447.25		
Jackson	\$137,454.22	\$68,222.90	\$0.00	
Jefferson	\$0.00	\$3,360.00	\$70,000.00	
Josephine	\$135,480.63	\$1.00		\$12,400.00
Klamath	\$90,706.00	\$35,167.88	\$100,880.00	
Lake	\$43,291.00	\$9,293.22	\$48,772.00	
Lane	\$134,260.00	\$45,228.31	\$72,000.00	
Lincoln	\$13,000.00			
Linn	\$26,460.00	\$67,059.12	\$60,000.00	\$5,000.00
Malheur	\$0.00	\$1,200.00		
Marion	\$39,686.98	\$5,083.99		
Morrow	\$66,950.00	\$2,693.20		
Multnomah	\$99,006.10	\$9,871.28		
Polk	\$49,500.00	\$15,820.00	\$49,500.00	
Sherman	\$0.00	\$3,865.60		
Tillamook	\$44,994.00	\$96,334.00		
Umatilla	\$0.00	\$652.38	\$4,200.00	
Union	\$0.00	\$119.71		
Wallowa	\$0.00	\$1,520.68		
Wasco	\$0.00			
Washington	\$21,743.19	\$87,002.40	\$56,900.00	
Wheeler	\$0.00	\$8,676.00		
Yamhill	\$29,900.00	\$23,180.39		
ESRI Parcel Model	\$0.00			
Totals	\$1,430,218.52	\$702,683.87	<i>\$692,572.00</i>	<i>\$17,400.00</i>
Total Requested			<i>\$709,972.00</i>	

ORMAP Funding Criteria

Revised: 11/21/2006

Requests from Oregon Counties for ORMAP grant funds generally exceed the available fund balance of future ORMAP funding cycles. Because of limited funding, it is necessary that all grant requests meet certain criteria in order to provide a fair and equitable distribution of ORMAP funds.

The ORMAP program, administered by the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR), created this document to communicate the criteria used to prioritize grant requests for ORMAP funds. ORMAP staff review the funding criteria and the priorities on a regular basis, modifications of each may occur based on either the fund balance or changes in the ORMAP goals.

Process

The first step in prioritizing grants occurs during an initial review by the department's ORMAP Coordinator. The county's proposal must meet all of the following ORMAP criteria:

1. Counties must conduct a successful pilot project or demonstrate a successful process.
(*pass/fail*)
2. Counties must maintain an online business plan. (*pass/fail*)
3. Counties must not have outstanding ORMAP fund balances or must demonstrate that outstanding funds will be used by project deadlines. (*pass/fail*)
4. The county must have a data sharing agreement in place with the Department of Revenue.
(*pass/fail*)

County grant proposals that meet all of the ORMAP criteria listed above are weighted as follows:

Project Type

- a. County edge matching projects – 5 pts
- b. Ongoing projects (as defined in county business plan) – 2 pts
- c. Counties that have completed a low percentage of tax lots that meet the ORMAP Technical Specifications – 2 pts
- d. Counties that are close to meeting the ORMAP Technical Specifications countywide – 2 pts

Technical Priority

- a. Tax lot/tax map improvements or mapping control development – 3 pts
- b. Tax lot and assessor database connections – 2 pts
- c. Software/hardware projects (including enhancements) – 1 pt

Policy Priority

- a. Projects that demonstrate multi-county efforts – 5 pts
- b. Grants demonstrating funding partnerships – 5 pts
- c. Grants that will cost significantly more if not funded in the current cycle – 3 pts

When the county grant request passes all the initial criteria and weighting, the ORMAP Technical Group reviews the proposal. This process is a thorough peer review of the application to ensure it:

- is technically sound;
- uses the most cost effective methodology;
- pursues ORMAP goals;
- has reasonable and measurable deliverables; and
- has a realistic timeline

When the grant request receives approval based on the criteria, weighting, and the Technical Group review, the department considers the funding request for the project. As stated in OAR 150-306.132 and 150-306.135, the Oregon Department of Revenue Director ultimately retains authority for the distribution of ORMAP funds.

Full funding for smaller grants may occur when the project is of priority, the ORMAP fund is healthy and the funds are available. Smaller grant means that the dollar amount requested falls within the bottom one-third of grant dollars requested. The department may also fully fund projects where the grant proposal shows that partial funding is unfeasible for the project or that there is a loss of cost savings or efficiencies to do otherwise.