

**Cadastral Framework Implementation Team Meeting
April 10, 2007
Local Government Center (AOC) - Salem**

Members Present: Cress Bates, Lane County; Dean Anderson, Polk County; Gail Ewart, Framework Coordinator and DAS-GEO; Phil McClellan, DOR; Marc Thomas, FGDC; Orrin Frederick, BLM;

Visitors Present: Rod Therriault, DOR; John Prychun, DOR; Roger Livingston, Washington County

Scribe: Cress Bates

Topic	Person	Action Req'd Yes/No	Comment
Introductions	All	No	
Cadastral FIT Committee relationships to ORMAP Tech group, PLSS FIT and Public Lands FIT	Gail/All	No	Dean Anderson facilitates PLSS FIT
Cadastral FIT Committee goals and work plan	Cress/All	Yes	Cress – start work on plan. Dean – report on legislative workgroup
Integration of Tax Lot data meeting ORMAP Technical Specifications	Cress/Phil /All	Yes	Gail – follow up on communication between ODOT and DOR
Survey Control Data Maintenance Tools within the GIS	Orrin/All	No	Marc – will look into setting up control data demo's.
Creating a Survey Control Data Model	Dean/All	Yes	Dean – PLSS FIT will start work on Control Data model.
Tax Lot Data Distribution Issues	Cress/All	No	5 min

A. Introductions (Cress/All)

Cress opened the meeting by thanking those present for agreeing to meet before the PLSS Workgroup meeting. This is the first meeting of Cadastral FIT and the intention is to start a discussion on the issues for which this committee will be involved and try to meet on a quarterly basis. We then went around the room for introductions.

B. Cadastral FIT Committee relationship to ORMAP Tech Group, PLSS FIT, and Public Lands FIT (Gail/All)

The ORMAP Tech Group has done a lot of work on cadastral issues; such as creating the ESRI ORMAP Parcel Model, publishing the Cadastral Data Exchange standard, and devising a set of Tax Lot Data Technical Specifications. Until recently, the ORMAP Tech group has been perceived as the “Cadastral FIT” committee. Gail handed out a map showing the current organizational structure of the “Oregon Spatial Data Framework” and gave some additional background on how we will, and are, organizing the Cadastral FIT. The new structure involves forming this group (Cadastral FIT) which will provide vertical integration and coordination for all elements in the theme. Currently there are

three workgroups: Tax Lots, PLSS, and Public Lands. The ORMAP Tech group will continue to function (on a practical basis) as the Tax Lot workgroup, with Cress Bates providing a solid connection between FIT and ORMAP. Dean Anderson has agreed to facilitate the PLSS workgroup, Gail Ewart will provide initial leadership for the Public Lands workgroup, and Cress Bates is the lead for the Cadastral FIT.

C. Cadastral FIT Committee Goals and Work Plan (Cress/All)

The group discussed what this committee might be working on and includes such things as:

- Vertical Data integration with other layers – such as administrative boundaries and tax code districts. Work on this will focus on identifying, describing and suggesting solutions to the Framework/Stewardship Coordinator.
- Horizontal integration across the State for tax lot data – such as edgematching along each County boundary.
- Creating an Implementation Plan for the development and stewardship of all elements in the Cadastral theme.
- Providing input to the PLSS workgroup for such issues as:
 - Maintaining Control data within the GIS
 - Creating a Control Data Model
 - Offering guidelines for tax lot adjustments when Control Data changes
- Investigating tax lot data distribution practices across the State, and across the Nation. There is a statewide partnership solution working on data sharing issues for all Framework elements. The effort involves local government officials and will request a legislative workgroup for resolving this and other issues. Gail suggested that Dean provide the group with status reports and let us know if and how we can be of assistance. The group recognizes that the tax lot data and assessor maps are widely needed by an array of organizations and any solutions will impact how we maintain and distribute this data.
- Provide a liaison between local government (primarily Counties) and State and Federal initiatives. Orrin Fredrick's (BLM) and Marc Thomas's (FGDC) Federal perspective will be helpful. Orrin mentioned that BLM is interested in pursuing automated land maintenance and that BLM would like to get control and tax lot information from local agencies to better update their data bases. Gail Ewart (State DAS); and Phil McClellan, Rod Therriault, and John Prychun (State DOR) will provide the State perspective. But we will also want to coordinate with other State agencies such as Forestry and ODOT. This can be done through the Framework process.

D. Integration of Tax Lot data that Meets ORMAP Technical Specifications (Cress/Phil/All)

One of the big issues here is nailing down the County Boundaries. Gail mentioned that Darlene at ODOT has been working on getting data sets from each County so that she can compare how these boundaries are lining up. Having accurate and agreed-upon county boundaries is critical and will make the horizontal integration of tax lot data (and other FIT data) easier to achieve. The committee talked about what ODOT is doing versus what has been done, and is still being done, through the ORMAP technical group with assistance from DOR. We recognized that there is some overlap and opportunities to improve communication between ODOT and DOR on this issue. The Cadastral FIT does not need to take the lead on this; but we do need to understand where there are

county edge-matching problems and how they will be resolved. It is important that County Surveyors have an opportunity to get involved in resolving these problems. Gail assured us that they are fully engaged in the process. We have examples of where edgematching is a problem between counties (such as the Lane-Linn line) and we need a strategy for addressing this. Gail will follow up with DOR and ODOT to mend the communication issues. All these concerns are being addressed elsewhere, but this group is well positioned to assist when appropriate. Rod T. said he has received tax lot data (as part of the round 2 exchange standard) and offered to overlay with each county dataset to see where significant gaps and overlaps exist. The horizontal steward could use that information to alert those counties that have problems.

E. Survey Control Data Maintenance with the GIS (Orrin/All)

As counties begin to complete their accurate tax lot base they are recognizing the need to have tools and processes to maintain the Control data on which the tax lots were built, and keep the Control data changes in sync with the Tax Lot data. Counties are currently using a variety of tools which include WinGMM, AutoCAD and more. In addition, Cartographers are interested in control data improvements so that new plats can be easily added to the tax lot data. However, if adjustments to the tax lot data are always taking place, then this can complicate the maintenance processes of other layers, such as zoning, city limits that are coincident with, or reference, tax lot lines.

It would be very helpful to have a set of tools that enable the surveyors to maintain control data in the GIS and keep the other dependant layers (such as tax lots) in sync. We thought that the BLM NILS project would move us this direction, but Orrin F. reported that the NILS project has stalled and it is not certain that any useful tools will soon result from this project. Marc T. mentioned the work being done by the Federal Cadastral Subcommittee and that there might be some information there useful to this group. He also mentioned that the State of Colorado has a project (and web site) called the Colorado Control Survey Information which provides a viewer and report generator for control data throughout the state. It might be worth looking at.

F. Creating a Survey Control Data Model (Dean/All)

The current ESRI ORMAP Parcel Data Model has some standalone feature classes for the control data. However, as we get further into the control data maintenance, and integrating this with both the tax lot and assessor map maintenance, then a more robust control data model seems needed. We have other types of control data that are not currently in the parcel model; such as DLC points, lines, polygons; Section polygons, and Township polygons. Dean said he would pursue this within the PLSS workgroup.

G. Tax Lot Data Distribution Issues (Cress/All)

This was put on the agenda so that the committee did not overlook this item; but we ran out of time to get into any detail discussion. This will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

This committee will meet quarterly, so as we get closer, Cress will schedule the next meeting for sometime in July if that will work for the members.