

Fall 2007 ORMAP Tech Group Meeting Meeting Minutes

September 27, 2007
10:00 am – 12:15 pm
Salem Field Office

Present:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Phil McClellan	DOR	Wendy Schink	Tillamook County
Alisha Macauley	DOR	Dave Barbour	Tillamook County
Brian Hansberry	Yamhill County	Steve Lucker	DOR
John Prychun	DOR	Roger Livingston	Washington County
Dean Anderson	Polk County	Bob Haas	Deschutes County
Cress Bates	Lane County PW	Rod Therriault	DOR
Steve Ganoie	Marion County	Doug Sackinger	Benton County
Donna Morse	Benton County	Merri Seaton	DOR
John Waffenschmidt	Lincoln County		

Facilitator: Phil McClellan

Scribe: Alisha Macauley

Introductions

Phil opened the meeting with introductions.

Agenda Additions

- Mark Kinslow requested that we talk about the testing tool
- Bob Haas – compensation for data exchange to DOR

Data Sharing (Letter from Cy Smith)

Cy was unable to attend the meeting to discuss data sharing but he did submit a letter. Here is what he had to say:

DAS has signed data license agreements with 13 counties and they have recently been requesting updated copies of the licensed data from those counties. They want to make the data available to state agencies and communicate with them to let them know the data is available, so as to reduce or eliminate data requests from state agencies to those 13 counties. They are making the same request of the three counties that make their data freely available, to make the data from all 16 counties available from a single source and to also reduce or eliminate data requests to those three counties. Phil notified the group that Cy will be traveling around to meet with counties regarding the issue. If you have any questions or concerns, Cy has noted in his letter to the group to “please feel free to contact me directly.”

Cy Smith
Statewide GIS Coordinator
NSGIC President-elect
DAS/Geospatial Enterprise Office
955 Center St. NE, Room 470
Salem, OR 97301
503-378-6066
<http://gis.oregon.gov>

ORMAP Deliverables: Taxlots or Taxmaps

At the September 9th meeting there were questions about what the deliverable was for some of the ORMAP grant applications. The deliverables need to include a per taxlot basis. If you're going to mention taxmaps that's fine, but you need to also include the number of taxlots as well.

2008 Shapefile Delivery (Goal 2)

- Meeting the Data Exchange Standard – Some counties are not meeting the Data Exchange Standards. There is a sample shapefile on the ORMAP website at http://www.ormap.com/cartography/othernotes/Sample_Taxlot_CDES.shp.zip If you have any questions, please contact Rod or Phil.
- Data Issues:
 - The Good – Thank you
 - The Bad – Goal 2 data does not edge match to other data.
 - The Non-Existent – There are 3 or 4 counties that did not submit anything new for 2007.
- Tax Map Boundaries – As mentioned at the last meeting; if the counties have taxmap boundaries already produced, please give them to DOR. This will eliminate time on DOR's part (won't have to build them) and will also free up some ORMAP funds.

Control Points

Recommendations from March 22, 2007 Tech Group meeting:

1. Keep the Minimum Requirements Document
2. Add anything ORS 209 requires to be in compliance
3. Add Latitude and Longitude fields
4. Add Vertical Datum field
5. Require that surveys be filed with the County Surveyor's Office

Main concerns – several of the minimum fields do not apply, need examples of data, or need to be better defined.

- There should be fields for Township and Range, this would give one more field to query.
- PLSS ID and GCDB number the same for each township.

- John Minor, suggested that the “PLSS ID” can be answered by referring to the BLM Manual of Instructions 1973, pages 105-116. This section of the manual assigns names to various PLSS corners (e.g. the 1/16 corner of the East/West centerline of the section is called the CE 1/16). The names follow logic but can get complicated.
- Latitude & Longitude -- called for, but not specified what format is to be used (i.e. decimal degrees or degrees and minutes) Is there a Statewide standard?
- PLSS corner descriptions, it would be good to provide an example for this field and probably all the fields.
- Auto method – Proportion, keypunched, and converted are all “calculated” methods for control points.
- Plat tie to control point GPS point – calculated, how can we get it to fit? (Cress)??
- ✓ John Waffenschmidt, from Lincoln County, requested that we send him a copy review the list of fields before ORMAP makes them required. And possibly make it available to other surveyors for review too.

Recorded vs. Filed Surveys

The question has come up about the difference between a “recorded survey” and a “filed survey.” In the above recommendations it suggests that surveys be filed with the County Surveyor’s office there a difference?

There is no difference between “recorded” and “filed.” If it’s going to be recorded then it will be filed. There are, however, surveys that are not required to be recorded and filed. Those surveys are used for the sole purpose of mapping.

It was decided by the group that having ORMAP require that all control collected on ORMAP projects was not cost effective and could reduce the pool of surveyors willing to collect “mapping grade control” for ORMAP projects. It was suggested that it be left up to the individual counties to decide if they would require the surveyor to file the control they collected with the County Surveyor’s Office, which everyone in attendance agreed upon.

It was suggested that collecting “survey grade control” for all cadastral mapping projects is going beyond the ORMAP Technical Specifications in many mapping applications. It was brought up that if you were going to be collecting PLSS corners that some contributing funds should be provided by the County Surveyor from their Corner Restoration Fund.

Phil summarized that ORMAP would not require counties to have a their mapping control filed with the surveyor since they would be use for “mapping proposes only.” If the surveyor is sent out to collect PLSS corner and restore it, there is an ORS to cover that process and the surveyor would follow those procedures. The group decided that collecting only survey grade control for every mapping project is beyond the scope of the ORMAP project’s technical specifications and will be subject to funding review.

SB 55 exceptions for “Cadastral Mapping”

Section 8 (13): *A person carrying out activities under ORS 306.125 or 308.245. This exemption applies to the transcription of tax maps, zoning maps and other public data records into Geographic Information System or Land Information System formatted cadastre and the maintenance of those cadastre, if:*

- (a) *The data are not modified for other than graphical purposes; and*
- (b) *The data are clearly not intended to authoritatively represent property boundaries.*

Dean Anderson, of Polk County, provided a copy of the Senate Bill 55 checklist. See attachment "Is it Surveying within the new definition of ORS 672?"

Framework

Cadastral- FIT: Cress Bates

Cress provide an update on the progress of the Cadastral FIT and it's three workgroups. The three workgroups in the Cadastral FIT are:

1. Taxlot Workgroup (aka ORMAP Tech Group)
2. PLSS Workgroup, chaired by Dean Anderson
3. Public Lands Workgroup, which is still in it's early planning stages.

The responsibility of these groups is to help define a standard, either for content or exchange, and stewardship. Gail Ewart, the State Framework (FIT) chair, held a meeting on September 18, 2007 to discuss the progress of the other FIT groups; there are currently 15 identified framework layers. You can find more information about these layers and the FIT effort on their website (<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/fit/FIT.shtml>). In the meeting Gail identified 3 top priorities for framework;

1. New Data Development
2. Stewardship
3. Communication (This will include some education elements)

If you have any questions you can contact Gail directly.

Cress then talked about some of the goals for the FIT and it's workgroups.

- Data exchange standard working
- Tool maintenance
- Survey data w/taxlot data
- Control data
- Focus next meeting on data distribution issues

PLSS Workgroup: Dean Anderson

Dean has held a few meeting of this workgroup and they have been working on issues that concern the PLSS layer.

- ✓ afraid of misuse of info/issues of distrust
- ✓ stewardship options

- ✓ goal 3 alternatives, BLM County Surveyors

Agenda Additions

Testing Tool – Dean Anderson and Rodney Therriault will work on an IT request to present to the ORMAP-ESRI programmers so that the testing tool will be built and properly tested before general release..

County request – The counties present believed that instituting a “subscription fee” would be a way to encourage the data sharing of the tax code boundaries, the ownership table, tax map boundaries, tax codes, and a county complete polygon done to the cadastral data exchange standard.

The suggestion was for the Department of Revenue to administer the sharing of taxlot data to state agencies [be the data steward] and that a subscription fee for the data could be paid to help cover the cost of the data delivery. Many of the counties already charge a similar fee for their data to government agencies and private companies. This would then become a contract between the counties and DOR which would require the counties meet all of the above deliverables.

Phil said that he would discuss it with Mark Kinslow, the CDOT Section Manager, and then bring it up to the Director at their meeting on October 4, 2007.

Tasks for Next Spring’s Tech Group Meeting

1. List of minimum data field requirements for ORMAP control points
2. Update on the ORMAP Technical Specifications Testing Tool
3. Update on the 2008 Goal 2 Delivery
4. Update Data Sharing and Data Subscription Suggestions

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 pm.

Is it Surveying within the new definition of ORS 672?

- | | Yes | No |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does it provide or offer to provide professional services that apply mathematics, geodesy and other sciences and involve the making of geometric measurements and gathering of related information pertaining to the physical or legal features of the earth? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does it provide or offer to provide professional services that apply mathematics, geodesy and other sciences and involve the making of geometric measurements and gathering of related information pertaining to improvements on the earth? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does it provide or offer to provide professional services that apply mathematics, geodesy and other sciences and involve the making of geometric measurements and gathering of related information pertaining to the space above or below the earth? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Does it provide or offer to provide professional services that apply mathematics, geodesy and other sciences and involve the development of measurements and information described in questions 1 through 3 above into graphics, data, maps, plans, reports, descriptions, projects or other survey products? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Is it a geodetic survey? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Does it establish, reestablish or replace boundaries or geodetic control monuments or reference points? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Does it locate, relocate, establish, reestablish or retrace any property lines or boundaries for any tract of land, road right of way or easement? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Was it a survey for the division or subdivision of a tract of land or the consolidation of tracts of land? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Did it involve locating and laying out alignments, positions or elevations for the construction of fixed works? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Did it involve performing or offering to perform any investigation, interpretation or evaluation of, or any consultation or testimony about any of the services described above? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Did it involve the collection, preparation, manipulation or modification of data related to any of the services described above, other than acting as a scrivener? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Did it fall within the new definition of photogrammetric mapping? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Did it result in surveys involving horizontal or vertical mapping control or geodetic control? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer to one or more of the above questions was yes, then the act or acts performed may fall within the new definition of the practice of land surveying. However, new exemptions were added to ORS 672.060, and if the act or acts fall within any of these exemptions, the act would likely be exempt from being regulated as the practice of land surveying.

Is the act exempt from regulation under Oregon law?

- | | Yes | No |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Did the person maintain or transcribe existing georeferenced data into a GIS or LIS format by manual or electronic means and the data are clearly not intended to indicate the authoritative location of property boundaries, the precise shape or contour of the earth or the precise location of fixed works of humans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Did the person perform activities under ORS 306.125 or 308.245 involving transcribing tax maps, zoning maps or other public data records into GIS or LIS formatted cadastre and maintain those cadastre where the data are not modified for other than geographical purposes and the data are clearly not intended to authoritatively represent property boundaries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Did the person prepare maps or compile databases depicting the distribution of natural or cultural resources, features or phenomena and the maps or data are not intended to indicate the authoritative location of property boundaries, or the precise shape or contour of the earth, or the precise location of fixed works by humans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Was the act performed by a federal agency or its contractors in the preparation of military maps, quadrangle topographic maps satellite imagery or other maps that do not define real property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Was the act performed by a federal agency or its contractors in the preparation of documents or databases into a GIS or LIS format, including but not limited to the preparation or transcription of federal census and other demographic data? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Was the act performed by a law enforcement agency or its contractor in the preparation of documents or maps for traffic accidents, crime scenes or similar purposes depicting physical features or events or generating or using georeferenced data involving crime statistics or criminal activities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Was the act performed by a peace officer as defined in ORS 161.015 or fire service professional as defined in ORS 181.610 in conducting, reporting on or testifying about or otherwise performing duties regarding an official investigation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Did the act result in the creation of general maps prepared for private firms or governmental agencies: (1) for use as guides to motorists, boaters, aviators or pedestrians; (2) for publication in a gazetteer or an atlas as an educational tool or reference publication; (3) for use in the curriculum of any course of study; (4) for use as an illustrative guide to the geographic location of any event (if produced by electronic or print media); or (5) for use as advertising material or user guides (if prepared for conversational or illustrative purposes)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If the answer to one or more of the above questions is yes, then the act or acts performed may fall within an exemption from regulation of the practice of land surveying. These exemptions were added to ORS 672.060.