

Special ORMAP Tech Group Meeting Meeting Minutes

June 12, 2008
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
Salem Field Office

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Steve Gano	Marion County	Krysta Hess	Clatsop County
Thomas Brateng	Polk County	David Cutting	Lane County
Cress Bates	Lane County P.W.	Bob Haas	Deschutes County
Rick Schack	DOR	Brian Hansberry	Yamhill County
Dave Barbour	Tillamook County	Phil McClellan	DOR
Jill Garlough	DOR	Roger Livingston	Washington County
Merri Seaton	DOR	Dean Anderson	Polk County

Facilitator: Phil McClellan
Scribe: Jill Garlough

Introductions

Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

Purpose of the meeting

The purpose of the meeting is for the Tech Group to discuss the funding criteria for ORMAP grants and putting it into administrative rule next spring. This draft rule would be used for the 2008 fall grant cycle (anticipated funding shortfall). The Tech Group will meet again after the fall funding to discuss how the rules worked and make any needed changes before making them official rules.

Defined ORMAP Funding Criteria

The group reviewed the funding draft dated May 2008. The following questions and suggestions were made.

ORMAP Policy Definitions:

2. Hardware and Software Purchases-It was suggested that counties include what the hardware/software purchases in their grant requests would be used for.
8. Geodatabase-Should this be renamed? If a county does not have Geodatabase this is not maintenance. If a county already has the database should this be considered for funding? It was suggested that "geodatabase" is a reference to an ESRI product and that

it should be called “digital data conversion”. This should help those counties that are not using a geodatabase or ESRI software.

“Project deliverables”-can counties use leftover money for different or next projects?

As long as the modification has been approved by DOR. It is acceptable for a county to request a contract modification to start work in its next project area, using surplus funds from an awarded contract only if the county has completed the area detailed in the original grant. If the county wishes to include a contract extension with this modification they may not be eligible for funds in the next grant cycle.

What should be done with leftover money?

Any funds remaining on a contract will be reverted back into the ORMAP fund to be use in a future grant cycle.

The “County” is the group requesting the funds. But all request are the responsibility of the Assessor’s Office, no matter who is actually doing the work outlined in the grant application; be it an outside contractor, different agency within the county, or employees with in the assessor’s office.

Criteria Rule Items:

DOR Criteria:

c. The county must have a data sharing agreement in place with DOR. (Pass/fail) A better definition of “data sharing” is needed. Should this be included in the Criteria Rules? Some type of signed agreement is needed.

f. Counties must provide a “reduction package” within their grant applications that would outline funding reductions of 15%, 30%, and 50%. Is it necessary to have this included in the grant application?

If the reductions were included in the grant applications the counties would already have identified what parts of the project are a priority if their grant requests were reduced and make the process easier for DOR should reductions be needed. Many agencies already provide similar reductions in their budgets.

Some felt that this would make more work for the counties. Others responded that if you do it ahead of time you wouldn’t need to do it later, either way you’re doing it.

Could it be asked for later if needed?

We could include in the rule “if requested” that way if the fund was healthy counties wouldn’t need to identify the reduction items in the grant application. Since DOR usually has a pretty good idea what the health of the fund is prior to the funding cycle. DOR could include in that funding cycle and request for a reduction package.

ORMAP Technical Group Committee Criteria:

B. The proposal has a realistic timeframe for completion (pass/fail). It was suggested that this be clarified. A clarification would be is the timeframe (1 year) in the grant application a realistic timeframe to complete the number and type of deliverable.

Can grants overlap if extended? It is possible that an extended contract is will overlap with another. Part of the process of getting a grant extension is to determine how the extension will affect other outstanding ORMAP contracts.

Non Rule Items:

1. Technical Ratings:

a. County edge matching projects-Should the points awarded vary?

The priority of edge matching varies from county to county.

Once a county has completed edgematching with neighboring counties could they be given a bonus pt/pts when applying for grants in the future?

Should this be considered a multi-county effort (see Policy Priority Rating 2a) therefore receiving those points as well?

There was a lot of discussion concerning the edgematching process and its priority to each county. It was determined by the tech group and the advisory committee a few years ago that edgematching projects would be an ORMAP priority and should receive priority in funding. Many rural counties don't see this as a priority because of the lack of taxlots along the boundaries. Many felt that this would help them because it was be "easier" for them to complete their edgematching, unlike in a more urban area.

There was then discussion as to how would ORMAP and the tech group will determine if a county is edgematched. It was thought that a county and its neighbors could agree to one boundary and map their taxlots to that agreed boundary they could be considered edgematched. The counties must be able to provide some documentation that an agreement has been made with the counties involved. Some felt that they would never come to a consensus with their neighboring counties, let alone other agencies within the county. Even though, these maps are for assessment purposes only, it is understood that the digital files are used for more than just assessment and this needs to be taken into consideration.

ORMAP understands this but we need to realize that ORMAP can only provide funding up to a certain point and to get maps that meet more than the A&T needs; we'll need find funding from other sources. If there is a need outside of the A&T, those folks should step up to provide funding beyond what ORMAP.

It was decided that DOR would provide additional points for those counties that can show that they have edgematched or come to a mutual agreement with neighboring counties

concerning the county boundary and the taxlots along that boundary. Also the number of points to be awarded would be determined by the percentage of the taxlots in the project that fall along the county boundary. A project with 5% of the taxlots along the boundary would receive fewer points than one with 50% of the taxlots along the boundary.

2. Policy Priority Rating:

a. Projects that demonstrate multi-county efforts- Should this be a yes/no rating with 1 point for yes and 0 points for no?

Should county edge matching be included in this rating? As long as it is a multi-county effort, once again, there must be an agreement with the neighboring counties.

b. Grants demonstrating funding partnerships-The number of points awarded for this was questioned. Again, should this be a yes/no rating with 1 point for yes and 0 points for no?

c. Grants that will cost significantly more if not funded in the current cycle- What percentage is significant? This would be difficult to determine without more information from the county. The county must document this in the grant application if they have identified that their could be a signification increase in cost if not funded at this time. This could include the loss of funding partnerships.

d. Counties that have contributed significant non-DOR resources to completing ORMAP Goal 6 products-Again, what percentage is significant? There was a formula proposed by members of the tech group that would be used to determine the total per taxlot cost.

Comparison of the total amount of ORMAP funds expended divided by the number of tax lots that are currently in Goal 6 compliant tax maps. A county in the 75 percentile measured by the lowest cost per tax lot receives five points; a county in the 50 percentile receives 3 points; a county in the 25 percentile receives 1 point.

Funding Appeals:

If a county “wins” its appeal, other grants may be adjusted to cover the new awarded value-This would be difficult to do.

Another option was suggested:

If a county “wins” its appeal the county would have to wait for the awarded money to be taken from the next funding cycle. All other counties receiving grants would be given their money as originally awarded before the appeal.

Future Agenda Items:

The Tech Group will meet again after the fall funding cycle to discuss how the rules worked and if any changes need to be made.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.