

MINUTES

2ND Spring 2008 ORMAPP Tech Group Meeting

March 27, 2008

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Oregon Dept of Revenue / South Salem Field Office

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Dean Anderson	Polk County	David Barbour	Tillamook County
Steve Barnett	Linn County	Cress Bates	Lane County PW
Thomas Brateng	Polk County	David Cutting	Lane County A&T
Steve Gano	Marion County	Robert Guntow	Polk County
Hall Guttormsen	IDS Inc.	Brian Hansberry	Yamhill County
Krysta Hess	Clatsop County	Sally Hood	DOR
Roger Livingston	Washington County	Phil McClellan	DOR
John Prychun	DOR	Joe Nelson	Washington County
Doug Sackinger	Benton County	Wendy Schink	Tillamook County
Merri Seaton	DOR	Rod Therriault	DOR

Facilitator: Phil McClellan

Scribe: Sally Hood

1. Introductions

Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

2. Additions to the Agenda

There are none.

3. Approval of Minutes from March 6, 2008

There were no additions or corrections.

4. Spring Grant Funding and Funding Criteria

Phil reviewed the suggested ORMAPP Grant awards. Revenues are down more than anticipated; this quarter's deposit will be 15% less than last quarter's. He also shared some of the criteria he used to apply grant funds:

1. County staff were contacted to determine what impact reduced funding would have on the project. If the project could not continue without 100% funding, it was not allocated any funds. Deschutes and Umatilla were affected in this process.
2. Outside contractors were taken into consideration. It was felt that contractors have more opportunities for their employees to work on other projects than the counties do; therefore the impact on staff reduction would be less for a contractor than a county.
3. If a county was close to completion, they were given priority. This affected Lake County; this will be their final request for remapping funds.
4. If a county was just starting the process, they could modify their project easily to reduce their deliverables. This affected Harney County's pilot project.
5. All outstanding ORMAPP funds were reviewed. If a county has a large outstanding grant, the progress of the current grant was revisited.

6. Any county using ORMAP funds to get control points was given priority. Phil attempted to not reduce the money for control if possible. This was done with the feeling that control is an important part of the remapping and needs to be collected ahead of time. By cutting this effort it could cause problems with future remapping.

There was some concern at the wide range in the cost of control (\$50 - \$700 per point). Phil had pointed out that this has been a topic before and we have tried to get input for the survey community and could not get a consensus from them about the cost of control. There were too many variables to be taken into consideration when preparing a control job to set a fixed price. If you set it too low you would not be able to get bids for the job. ORMAP has left this up to the Tech Group in the past to help give direction for costs and the counties to seek the best deal they could.

A discussion of the current funding criteria document followed. Phil uses the criteria when looking at the grants, but did not assign points and approve grants based on a total number of points. Some suggestions were made:

1. Expand the authority of approving grants to a committee rather than just one person. This would protect Phil as well as get more input into the decision making process.
2. Give the advisory committee an opportunity for input into the decision making process.
3. Density should be taken into account. Counties with more taxlots should be awarded a larger share of the funds.
4. Document the decision making process.
 - a. What were the criteria used to make the decision?
 - b. Why was the decision made?
 - c. What is the expectation for future funding for counties that received none this cycle?
 - d. Define the Tech Group's function in this process.
 - e. Document a narrative county by county for each decision.

Phil said he took a couple passes at trying to balance out the grant request. First he reviewed the grants from counties that had a large outstanding fund balance. This was defined as counties that had an outstanding balance greater than \$80,000. He spoke with a couple counties that had spring request in their business plans and had them update their business plan and forgo this cycle.

The next was to separate out grants that were asking for "large" grants; grants requests over \$60,000. He first attempted to apply a straight percentage reduction to all of the grants. This required a reduction of 35% to balance the fund. After speaking to the counties, many expressed that a reduction of that size would all but "derail" their ORMAP effort. He next went through each grant and attempted to modify the grants to reduce the deliverables. He took into consideration, outstanding balance, type of project, and who was doing the work (i.e. county staff or contractor). Counties that were using a contractor was asked to take the bigger reductions, this was with the thought that a contractor could be more flexible with the size and types of projects.

He tried to give some preference to the counties that were close to meeting the technical specifications with their county remapping project and would not be asking for any more funds for remapping. This was in the hopes to be able to provide some funding to the majority of the counties. He acknowledged that it may not have been the best, and some counties were asked to take a larger reduction. Some counties grants meet all of the criteria, but were felt to be a project that could wait until a later date to complete.

Would Phil attach a copy of the "Grant Summary" document with a narrative of how he came to the decision on the dollar amounts.

A suggestion was made to reevaluate any outstanding grant funding and request those counties modify their contracts and perhaps revert any outstanding dollars. Phil explained that process happens when a county requests an extension; an evaluation of the project is done and the decision is made to extend the contract or revert the funds.

Phil will send out an updated grant approval document after he finds out what the deposit is for this quarter. Attached will be Roger's spreadsheet showing a historical record of ORMAP grants by county.

The question was raised regarding modifying the grant deliverables to accommodate the reduced funding. Phil said that process would happen. Merri suggested that in the future when each county submits its grant requests that it includes a "reduction package." This would prioritize the deliverables, which parts of the grant they would prefer to be funded, and to show what deliverables could be completed with a 10%, 30%, or 50% grant reduction.

The suggestion was made to increase funding of the ORMAP program. Phil explained that is a legislative process. If a request was made to increase funding, the whole program could be reviewed and there is a potential to lose funding altogether.

Phil requested that each county submit and Township & Range map with each section highlighted showing completion progress.

5. Statewide Taxlot Shapefile (Goal 2)

Rod Therriault gave an update on the shapefiles delivered to the Cadastral Data Exchange Standard. Only three worked:

- ❖ Deschutes
- ❖ Multnomah
- ❖ Washington

He has spent a lot of time fixing the submitted data to get it to work. Several people requested that he just let them know if the data failed so they can correct the problem themselves. Rod agreed to send the data back to the counties with an explanation as to why it failed.

After a discussion, the following list of criteria to submit a countywide taxlot map was agreed upon:

- No holes in taxlots (all non taxlot polys will be attributed with water, roads, rails, or NONTL per the data exchange standard)
- The taxlot shapefile's table meets the current Data Exchange Standard
- MapClass field is populated
- MapRelCode field is populated
- Tax code map
- Map Index (if created, many counties stated that they did not maintain a map index layer)
- Digital map images (PDFs of the Assessor's Maps)
- Real property table (at this time the table is required but the data within the table is optional.)

Rod will write a procedure for putting the taxlot shapefile into the data exchange standard. John Prychun will test it. The finalized procedure will be emailed to everyone by April 2. Please submit the shapefile to DOR by Tuesday, April 15th.

Meeting adjourned 12:00 pm.