

5/28/2024: Cadastral TWG

Attendees

- Robin Dunn - IDL
- Andrea Ballard – Bonner County
- Byron McCombs - BLM
- Chris Haines - IDL
- Josh Enterkine - BSU
- Kathy Riffie – Valley County
- Laurie Frederick – Valley County
- Mark Wasdahl – ITD District 3
- Megan Wheatley - ITS
- Wilma Robertson - ITS
- Tina Fuller - ITS

Notes:

- Draft Standard
  - There will likely be two versions - a public version and a state agency user version. Focus should be on the public (simpler) version first.
  - To determine the user's needs of the Publication PLSS we should use a Survey123 targeted to professionals that use the PLSS such as parcel editors.
- What should be included in the publication PLSS standard?
  - Polygon Layers:
    - 5 Polygon layers: Townships, Sections, Secondary Divisions (QQs, tracts and Governmental lots), Meanders and Special Surveys (such as mining claims etc.).
  - Control Points:
    - The consensus during the meeting was not to include points in the publication data. If people want to see PLSS corner points there should just be one authoritative source, and that is the MCPD.
  - Corner Perpetuation Filings CP&F's
    - Chris: 98% of the time we don't have the CP&F files - so IDL doesn't tie any of those documents to their fabric.
    - Attaching CP&F to corners is an entirely different project. While helpful additional information for perhaps the more comprehensive PLSS dataset, it will be a huge amount of work to put together and is out of scope for the data, standards and workflows that are currently proposed.
- Does the standard need an indicator of accuracy, similar to that found in the CAD-NSDI?  
The ideas we discussed are:
  - Consensus that having some measure of accuracy in the public dataset is very valuable.
  - Including a 'source' field (e.g. 'GPS', 'Control Point', 'Original survey') and date would give clues about accuracy.
- Info about practices in ITD District 3:
  - The district does its own surveying - we have a combination of control points - internally collected and collected by Counites, Contractors, etc.
  - ITD has done some surveying specifically intended to access control point data accuracy using different technologies for collection and correction.
  - ITD contractors do serve up their points to the MCPD.

- ITD does use the BLM PLSS layer for reference - but does not use that as part of the official record that is used within ITD District 3.
- Does the publication standard need to link to original surveys either on GLO, or IDL survey used by Chris, or MCPD control point, etc.?
  - IDWR links every TR to the GLO website with all the BLM and GLO surveys for that TR. Linking it to a scan of the survey or control point used would add considerable effort. The consensus of the group was that this is out of scope.
- IDL wanted to distinguish true data (metes and bounds) from anything calculated or adjusted.
  - When using surveys the recorded bearing and distance should be entered into the Parcel Fabric. They will remain unchanged even if the polygon is adjusted the calculated bearing and distance would be different.
- Schema's currently in use
  - ITS did a comparison of the publication PLSS datasets published by the BLM, IDL and IDWR as a starting point to pick which attributes should be included in the "The Idaho Map" standard.
- Acceptable sources of control points to use for adjustments of the parcel fabric: Does it need to be survey grade?
  - Chris: From the IDL perspective - there are instances where field surveyors will go out and use a Garmin to get something that is better than the data in the data (800 meter to 30 meter accuracy).
    - There are cases where the error logged does not provide sufficient improvement to include the data collected.
    - **'Accuracy' and 'data of update' could be data source fields.**
    - IDL does have a field that indicates data source (survey grade, GPS collection, etc.) in addition to the accuracy/error fields.
  - Wilma: Corner perpetuation files?
    - These should be recorded with the County.
  - Byron: I have information digitized from quad sheets in my data - it all comes back to trusting the source.
    - Do they have the monument or do they just think they have the monument?
    - It's all in evaluating the data and the source.
  - Mark: We have seen several examples of how the projection that the data is collected in and how that is recorded.
    - There are several ways to go about documenting the collection methods and the accuracy of the data that is collected.

#### Next Steps:

- Develop a draft schema based on the fields available in the BLM source data (the fabric), and the BLM, IDL and IDWR publication schemas. Use this schema, using a survey, to ask stakeholder which attributes in the schema are very important to them, and which ones they would never use.
- Review Results at the next Cadastral TWG and use the results to set next steps from there.

#### Action Items:

1. ITS to compare different existing schemas and propose extensive draft schema for publication based on BLM source data and guided by which attributes other agencies (BLM, IDL and IDWR) put into their publication PLSS datasets. Robin/ITS to distribute the Draft Standard to the group for review.

2. Build Survey123 around the draft schema and ask stakeholders which attributes in the schema are very important to them, and which ones they would never use.
3. Robin/ITS to create and distribute a Survey123 survey to collect stakeholder feedback on extensive draft proposed in action item 1.
4. Tina to share meeting information for the requested meeting to talk Parcel Fabric with Esri at the UC to the group.

Next Meeting:

- TBD