

Admin FIT Meeting

Tuesday May 24th

Location: Oregon Department of Agriculture

Members Present: Corey Plank, Randy Dana, Chad Crockett, Milt Hill, Phil McClellan, Bill Clingman, Diana Walker

Items to discuss:

Need a new Leader (I, Diana, wish to resign as lead)-

Chad Crockett at ODOT will take over as the Lead for Admin FIT.

Diana will stay on as member.

Who actually is using Admin FIT standard?

- ODOT is for their District and Regional Boundaries. They have not yet started using the standard for City Limits.
- BLM is for County and State Boundaries (Using the BLM version which is very close to Admin FIT standard just a little different in wording).
- DLCD is not for the UGB.
- ODA has started following the standard for their Ag Water Quality Management area as these areas are being updated.

The standard on the web needs to be updated-

Milt will follow though and adopt this standard as it is on the web since we all adopted it long ago and the ball was dropped. The standard will be reopened when necessary.

The four identified Workgroups are going to be removed from the Admin FIT webpage (but four-way categorization of boundary types will be retained, at least for now, as a useful way to organize the data elements within the Admin Boundaries theme).

Out of the 100 plus themes on the Admin FIT list is actually being maintained and shared

Community Map effort - how does it effect Admin FIT or how does Admin FIT effect the community map effort

Milt, Chad and Don Pettit (Preparedness FIT Lead) will compare the two FITS list (preparedness needs and admin 100 plus themes) to see how they compare, what themes need to be worked on, where are "we" at with the needed themes. A lot has changed in the past 2 years and we may find a lot has been

done.

This sub-group then will send out what they find to the whole Admin FIT group and we will all be able to give comments via email. In doing this, we hope we will be able to give the Web Servers/Community Map effort the answers to their questions as to what are the high priority themes and then getting the steward to follow the Admin FIT standard.

Where are we with the Admin FIT -

See above, we just need to kick-start the group again to address the above needs.

There are counties that are maintaining tax code areas as a separate layer of polygon features. The ongoing effort at the Secretary of State's office is to create a county-level GIS interface with the statewide Voter Registration system. This may drive some counties to create additional admin boundaries that, up to now, they haven't had a business need for. Some may be derived from tax code areas, but others will not (such as tax lot-specific boundaries of soil and water conservation districts, and even board-zones within districts in some cases). There are many Admin FIT themes that are tax code boundaries.

From Bill in an email:

I want to share something else I've learned recently with respect to boundaries:

For The National Map, the city limits and other jurisdictional boundaries are being provided by the Census Bureau. This is problematic because those boundaries, by design and intent, are "topologically integrated" boundaries intended solely for the proper enumeration of population, and they are NOT the actual boundaries in many cases. This is also a problem with the Census Bureau's own web maps and map services. I am hoping to follow up on this issue with folks at the Census Bureau, and see if there is any chance of them looking elsewhere (state-level stewards?) for actual boundaries they can use in place of their topologically integrated boundaries.