

Cadastral Reference Workgroup

Department of Administration
August 27, 2010
9:00 – 11:30 AM MST



Attendees

Jack Clark	Ada County Assessor's Office
Kevin DeRossett	Bureau of Land Management
Eric Rafn	Idaho Department of Water Resources
Bob Smith	Idaho Geospatial Office
Wilma Robertson	Idaho Geospatial Office
Gail Ewart	Idaho Geospatial Office
Walt Bulawa	Idaho State Tax Commission
Donna Pitzer	Reclamation, Chair Cadastral Reference Group
Jeff Servatius	Idaho State Tax Commission
Renee Bettis	Idaho Department of Lands
Tim Geary	Bureau of Land Management
Sheldon Bluestein	Retired

On the phone:

Stan French	Bureau of Land Management
-------------	---------------------------

Comparison of three existing Cadastral Reference layers

Walt Bulawa compared the following three Cadastral Reference layers to determine its suitability to function as the nascent dataset for the TIM Cadastral Framework:

1. LSIS - downloaded 03/2010 from Geocommunicator website
2. IDWR – received from Eric Rafn
3. CAD NSDI – received from Nancy Von Meyer through Donna Pitzer

In evaluating gap/overlap topological errors: LSIS had 5917, IDWR had 19,975 and CAC NSDI had 47. Not all gaps are errors in that some missing data holes qualify as topological gaps.

The coverage of the state was complete for the IDWR representation while that offered by CAD NSDI had some substantial holes in Lemhi and Custer counties as well as smaller gaps in Shoshone, Adams, Bonneville, Caribou and Clark counties. The LSIS representation had additional holes in coverage in Idaho, Clearwater, Boundary and Bonner counties.

Comparing section corners to randomly selected county control (received from Twin Falls, Latah and Gem counties), the error from control was 49 feet for LSIS/CAD NSDI/IDWR and 46 feet for section corners shown on the US Topographic map layer from ESRI on-line. The LSIS/CAD NSDI/IDWR were grouped because, at the 1:1000 scale used, they were seen as coincident and were not differentiable for measurement. In fact, in comparing the absolute values of the difference in the measured distance of CAD NSDI versus LSIS to county control, the average was found to be 0.6 feet which is why they were seen to be largely coincident.

That is not to say however that they did not have very large differences in the placement of section boundaries in some areas. Each of the representations differed substantially from each other and from the sections as displayed on the ESRI on-line service in some areas of the State.

Each of the three representations also had a considerable number of “attribute error” anomalies where section polygons were not rectangular but suffered from odd inclusions and diversions.

Bob Smith and Walt Bulawa recommend that CAD-NSDI as the nascent dataset for the TIM Cadastral Reference Framework.

The motion to accept CAD-NSDI as the nascent dataset passed. Jack Clark voted “nay” since, even though CAD-NSDI is the best of the three selected datasets, what would be preferred is that a team of qualified surveyors recalculate GCDB for the state.

Action item: Donna Pitzer will acquire CAD-NSDI data from neighboring states and place it on an FTP site so that people can see how the data behaves across state boundaries.

Fairview has delivered the final iteration of the CAD-NSDI. Currently the BLM has formed a team to discuss the maintenance strategy for the CAD-NSDI in the future. Kevin emphasized that the BLM is only interested in Federal Interests Lands. Any BLM updates done outside Federal Interests Lands would have to be funded by agencies other than the BLM.

Cadastral Reference Stewardship Plan

Most of the meeting was spent discussing and updating the Cadastral Reference Stewardship Plan. Instead of describing the changes in the meeting notes, please review the latest draft of the Stewardship Plan on <http://gis.idaho.gov/portal/framework/cadastral.htm>.