

## CADASTRAL REFERENCE WORKGROUP

Bureau of Reclamation  
230 Collins Rd.  
Boise, ID

**December 4, 2009**  
**9:00 – 11:30 a.m. MST**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Donna Pitzer	Reclamation, Co-lead for the Cadastral Reference group
Gail Ewart	IGO
Jack Clark	Ada County Assessor's Office
Walt Bulawa	ISTC
Rayce Ruiz	ITD, ISPLS
Sheldon Bluestein	The World
Eric Rafn	IDWR
Dan Narsavage	Ada County Assessor's Office
Kevin DeRossett	BLM
Gary Wilbert	Idaho Power
<b>By Phone</b>	
Marc Thomas	Cadastral Liaison
Wendy Ecklund	IDFG
Bob Smith	IGO
Stewart Ward	Dioptra
Eric Smith	Fremont County
Craig Rindlisbacher	Madison County

### **Review meeting minutes of August 28, 2009**

Action item from previous meeting – Stewart Ward was to inquire with an Idaho Power contracted surveyor regarding releasing PLSS control to outside entities.

Travis Hanks is the surveyor and reported to Stewart that he does not correct his information through OPUS and does not tie into any NGS control points, therefore all of his coordinates are +/- 30 ft. If we want his data, he will have to discuss it with his supervisor.

Gary Wilbert reports that he talked to Jan Bryant, their department manager and Frank Myner their GIS manager. Gary asked if Idaho Power could participate in the Control Point Inventory and Jan said that it is a liability issue and Idaho Power would not be able to participate under any circumstances. That would include consultants.

The meeting minutes were approved.

### **Idaho Parcel Information System - A Conversation**

Gail reports that the Idaho Land Title Association has agreed to partner with the Clerks and Records of Idaho and forward a legislative proposal for Recordation Modernization which will include a recordation fee increase. They will present that proposal this legislative session. We will see how that is received by the legislature. If they are unsuccessful this year, perhaps we, the GIS cadastral community, could be

included in the partnership and present a proposal that would help all concerned. We will be better prepared at that time.

Related to that, at the invitation of Don Ebert who is the President of the District II IAC (North Central Idaho), Bill Reynolds presented our ideas on the Idaho Parcel Information System and asked for feedback. Angela Vanderpas, James Zehner and several county officials were present. Several comments from the group were received. Bill is writing up a report on the meeting. A summary will be added to our cumulative report on these meetings. The report is sent to the Governor's office, the Director of Dept. of Administration, the CTO, the Cadastral Leadership and all six Presidents' of the IAC Districts who in turn disseminate to their membership to keep everyone informed.

Gail asked for any other suggestions from the group on how to obtain sustainable funding. Currently we have discussed a recording fee on a land transaction, a parcel verification fee and a very small fee added to property tax. Bill Reynolds said that one idea from the District II meeting was a charge for distributing copies of documents either digitally or by hardcopy.

Sheldon Bluestein commented that title companies and mortgage companies are pushing at the national level to have a nationwide cadastre implemented and perhaps some funding will come from that. They are putting forth the idea that if they would have had a national cadastre, they could have predicted and perhaps mitigated the real estate collapse.

Gail replied that even if that money would materialize, it is not sustainable.

Marc Thomas pointed out that Idaho can be more prepared for any funding by updating the NSGIC RAMONA database (Now called State Inventory). The Wildland Fire committee has shared their information to RAMONA and it is the State's responsibility to maintain.

Gail reports that discussions have occurred on updating and maintaining that information, but resources have been too scarce.

Question: What is the RAMONA/State Inventory?

This might be a way of tracking our own progress on county parcel creation.

Gail – NSGIC also has a specific parcels work group. Gail is a member of that group; Jeff Servatius is the primary contact for Idaho. They have had some activity, but we don't know if the NSGIC survey occurred. Stu Kirkpatrick is the lead for that group.

Question: How does this group's activity tie in with RAMONA, if at all?

Participation in this system can only enhance our reputation as serious players in this arena and it could potentially be a useful tool for our own purposes.

Eric Rafn states that Michael Ciscell is also very involved with what individual counties have done with their parcel data.

**Action Item** - Dan Narsavage and Bob Smith will explore the RAMONA database and report back on its functionality.

**Action Item** – Ask Jeff Servatius to report on the activities of the NSGIC parcels work group.

Question: Is the emergency response community interested in helping to fund parcel development and distribution?

Gail reports that Col. Shawver stated that parcels are critical to emergency response. But, they are just in the initial phases of putting their plans and documents together and moving forward with funding requests. At this time, where parcels will fit in and how they might get funded is unclear.

## Montana CPD Interface and Spreadsheet

Donna was given the Montana site where the service is being tested.

<http://testgisservice.mt.gov/MCPDviewer/>

Donna has explored the interface and demonstrated it for the group. Several issues were discovered and feedback was provided to RJ Zimmer. He was able to address or provide answers to most of the issues.

**Action Item** – Donna posts her questions and RJ Zimmer's answers to the web site.

The demonstration proved that technical support is essential to not only make the system function as it should, but to be able to take user feedback and either address the issues or collect the comments for future revisions to the interface. Those resources would need to be identified in Idaho if we have a system like this.

Question: Do we need to adopt this interface or can we build our own?

Donna replied that Bob Smith and Walt Bulawa did some prototype interfaces about a year ago and the result was good, but it is clear that it takes some resources to make it work.

Question: Is there a way for Idaho to help Montana fix or resolve these problems and assist them in getting a working system in place sooner?

Question: Should we ask for the code, set up a test site here on a server that has the necessary software and see if we can address the problems ourselves? If we do that, will we be duplicating the same problem solving processes that Montana will have to work on?

Donna briefly demonstrated the latest version of the FGDC interface. It is clearly in the beginning stages of development and will not be ready for a while.

Marc Thomas pointed out that the old version required a "gatekeeper" for uploading data, but the newer version will allow anyone to upload data and the user is responsible for knowing what they download and use.

Bob Smith commented that the Google API has limitations and demonstrated a FlexLM application that he has created.

Walt suggested that Donna contact Stu Kirkpatrick and see where he is at in addressing the problems and issues we are seeing. If he is close to getting them resolved we should wait to ask for the code. If it looks like the problems won't be resolved for several months, we should move forward.

Question: Could we take the database back end and put a smoother running front-end/interface on it?

A concern was raised there is usually a problem to take someone else's code and try to make fixes on it. This might not be worth the effort.

General consensus is that we should give Montana time to sort out the issues before we request the code. Whatever the case, at least looking at the code would be prudent before we make the decision to try to develop our own front end.

The spreadsheet/database portion of the MCPD was shown.

Eric Smith discussed the spreadsheet that is used to populate the database. He used control point information that he has been collecting from different sources and surveyors. He began developing his own data model for storing the information and then learned of the MCPD and the efforts of our group. He volunteered to try putting the data he has into the MCPD spreadsheet format to 1) see what level of effort it would

take and; 2) provide that to us to help populate Idaho's data base whenever it comes into existence.

Eric has about 2,000 points right now.

He demonstrated that it is relatively easy to take information stored as a spreadsheet and populate the standard spreadsheet. However, a lot of the fields will be empty as the surveyors were not requested to provide the needed data.

Eric observed that several of the items listed in the look up tables look specific to Montana and need to be revised for Idaho.

**Action Item** – Stewart Ward, Jack Clark, Rayce Ruiz and Eric will review the look up table and offer recommendations on changes to meet Idaho's needs.

**Action Item** – Donna will send Eric more background information on the data model for the MCPD.

Question: Did Montana go through a formal standards process detailing the standard for submitting a control point, either GCDB or other points?

Donna replied that RJ Zimmer, a registered land surveyor, is the chair of the Geodetic Control committee in Montana and that the data base design and data model were developed by this committee, but whether there was a formal standard developed and adopted is not known.

**Action Item** – Ask RJ Zimmer if a formal standard was developed.

Question: Who is responsible for developing the standards for this database? Is it the surveying community or is it the GIS community.

The control point database is a copy of the surveyor's information that will be used by the GIS community for GCDB enhancement, but it is also a tool that surveyors could use to store their own information and to research data collected by others. Marc Thomas observed that the database/spreadsheet contains fields that are found in the FGDC Cadastral Data Content Standard and therefore are common among most of the control point databases that are out there.

Rayce commented that ITD is currently looking at their policy of consultant surveys and how they place monuments. Perhaps this would be a good time to approach ITD and see if a requirement to report their work in this spreadsheet format and submit it to this database could be added to the policy. ITD solicitors are currently working on legislation to codify their policy and make it consistent statewide. This is something to consider. The benefit to the department needs to be highlighted and emphasized.

**Action Item** – Donna will review the standard policy developed by the GIO to get a better picture on what standards development is really all about.

### **CAP Grant Opportunity**

Examined the categories presented in the NSDI Cap Grant announcement for 2010. The only categories that seem to offer any possibilities are Category 2 and Category 7.

Category 7 will not be considered as Idaho was awarded a Cat 7 grant last year and would have a very small chance of being considered for an award in 2010 as per Tracy Fuller.

Gail sent an email to Tracy Fuller explaining what groups/themes would be interested in applying for a grant and asking what categories he thought any of those groups might fit in to. She has not heard back from him at this time.

Category 2 deals with stewardship. Gail explained that the Cadastral Reference groups efforts fit into this category as we could demonstrate how we plan to work with BLM to collect control information and use that for GCDB enhancement.

Donna requested that someone take the lead in thoroughly vetting these categories, determining if any of these are applicable to the group and creating the application.

**Action Item** – Craig Rindlisbacher will examine the categories for any tie in to Cadastral Reference.

**Action Item** – Marc Thomas will also contact Bob Ader about these opportunities.

**Action item** - Contact Michael Ciscell and see if he is interested in taking the lead and examining these categories and pulling together an application if feasible.

### **PLSS for the Nation**

Marc Thomas briefly explained that PLSS for the Nation is a nationwide effort to get a standard PLSS layer for the PLSS states. This will require that state boundaries match. Will require that other PLSS providers be involved. Stewards will be identified and need to be involved. BLM will play a smaller role unless the state is mostly federal.

### **Updating the I Plan**

Discuss at next meeting

**Action Item** – Sheldon will take a first look at the I plan and lead the discussion at the January meeting.