

Montana Cadastral Working Group

January 19, 2022: 10:00 – 11:30 am

Meeting Notes

Attendees (28): Jeff Hedstrom (MSL), Wally Gladstone (NECI), Will Pedde (US Forest Service), Nathan Teats (US Forest Service), Brandy Holstein (DOR), Michael Fashoway (MSL), Erin Fashoway (MSL), Gina Mazza (DNRC), Alison Kennedy (DOR), Mike Powell (Yellowstone County), Jeremy Grotbo (Butte-Silver Bow), Matt Bell (MT Land Reliance), Matt Trebesch (MSL), Dan Stahly (Stahly Engineering), Mike Snook (Missoula County), Bob Holliday (MSL), Warren Roe (Gallatin County), Allen Armstrong (BLM), Ken Miller (Ravalli County), Chris Crecelius (Flathead County), Meghan Burns (MSL), Evan Hammer (MSL), Brian Shaw (NOAA), Aaron Vaughn (City of Great Falls), Andy Rahn (MT Land Source), Cheryl Hohman (Flathead County), Rob Ahl (US Forest Service)

Introductions

- Affiliation/organization, outlook of TWG, current role or uses of Cadastral
- Goals & Objectives of TWG
 - Contribute to & review a Cadastral Assessment Plan
 - Collectively make recommendations for improvements to be made to Cadastral data
 - Create a best practices document for maintaining Cadastral/land records
 - Establish a new methodology to be used for prioritizing PLSS control collection areas

Current State of Cadastral

- Methodology for determining these areas
 - Redrawing efforts of sections/quarter sections
 - Bit of a “art form” technique used to mesh the PLSS or parcel metes & bounds
 - Search of plats & COGO cadastral lines from existing/new control
 - Examining the metes & bounds of the PLSS lines on the surveys
 - Determining whether it’s a COGO or PLSS issue
 - Wrong basis & bearing, would be correlated to a COGO issue
 - Older surveys not tied to geodic north or State Plane Grid, would be a COGO issue
- Other ideas or thoughts
 - A need for having the cadastral adjustment processes/techniques documented
 - Many modern surveys do not or not required to completely tie-in into the PLSS
 - Which seems problematic from a Cadastral maintenance standpoint
 - No tie-point when GCDB adjustments are made
 - Some sort of automated/machine learning technique of identifying “bad areas” in relation to the aerial imagery
 - Future vision: publish coordinates on all surveys
 - This working group could be empowered to rally/encourage the survey community to publish survey coordinates on plats being filed
 - Through the means of the MLIA Council, then working with other groups like MaCo & MARLS
 - Documenting best practices & land record techniques
 - Defining what a “bad area” is, from a Cadastral Framework standpoint

- Simplify/generalize the survey control submission process
 - Often surveyors don't know what format or who to send the data to
 - The coordinates and other relevant information could be exported out of the surveyor's geomatics software.

Evaluation of Adjustment Priority Areas

- Ensuring the State is aware of these "bad" areas
 - Submission process, a survey via ServiceNow, hopefully soon
 - Anyone, including Cadastral stakeholders could submit issues to the State as it relates to any MSDI framework layer
- A map displaying conflict areas
 - Documenting certain areas on a map that Department of Revenue has reviewed and there's some sort of underlying discrepancy or conflicting survey information
 - Map could be used by anyone as a lookup if there's an existing issue with an area and if it had been examined before
 - Much of our files that have identified these "bad" areas with an underlying discrepancy just live in either our computer or within a file cabinet
 - Information could be compiled as a way to pass research or documented land review where conflicting information may have been discovered onto another user of the map
 - Could be useful for the Cadastral community/citizens to see this information

Next meeting: Wednesday, July 20, 10:00-11:30am