

Cultural/Demographic Framework Update – September 30th, 2003

Outline of Information

Framework Priorities	1
Pilot Layer Priorities	1
C-FIT Pilot Update	2
C-FIT Confidentiality	3
2003-2004 Funding opportunities.....	3
Implementation Plans.....	3
Address Content Standards	3
Facilities Content Standard	4
Cultural Content Standard	4

Greeting,

I need to apologize for not coordinating very many Cultural GIS Framework Implementation Team (C-FIT) meeting over the last few months, but I have been working with Diana Walker and the Administrative FIT (A-FIT) and many of our issue overlap with their current activities. If you have a chance, review the work Diana and A-FIT have been doing. There is an important overlap between many of the Administrative activities and C-FIT since many of the cultural/demographic related data are bounded by administrative and/or jurisdictional boundaries. I also need to apologize for the length of this email, but I hope to cover a lot of material so we can maximize any future meetings.

---Joe

Framework Priorities (attached spreadsheet [FIT Priorities.pdf](#))

Cy asked the chairs of each FIT's to get input for the upcoming ranking for FIT themes. We were asked to think globally about this and create a priority that is beneficial for multiple purposes. Attached is a spreadsheet with the major FIT themes. Please review these and rank them based on the criteria in the attached spreadsheet. Forward the spreadsheet back to me and I will tabulate the results for the ranking. If you have any questions feel free to give me a call. Also free to make any additional comments.

Pilot Layer Priorities (attached spreadsheet [CFIT Layers.pdf](#))

Last year, CFIT prioritized several themes. These were: 1) address points, 2) critical facilities (i.e. building footprints) and 3) cemeteries and anthropological/historical sites. Several other cultural/demographic data sets are currently in development.

I have worked on updating a statewide matrix of themes, existing stewards, etc. I have attached my draft of this and am looking for additional input from C-FIT. Let me know of any mistakes and what people think are the top 3 layers in terms of overall importance to the C-FIT. We will use this information for prioritizing layer development and proposed funding. If possible indicate the reasoning for the importance of the data and overall usages (and enterprise benefits).

C-FIT Pilot Update (Information provided by John Ritter, OIT)

The Pilot involved using methods for creating a point address file that might be used in other situations. The first method used was to generate a point file from SITUS addresses using ETAK and/or TIGER street center line file data. An examination of point addresses using both ETAK and TIGER data demonstrated some fundamental problems in using those data. The problem is that, in an ideal world, we expect the points that are generated from the geocoding process to be able to be associated (1:1) with the available parcel data, thus giving us real-world coordinate locations for each address point.

In theory this appears to be a reasonable approach, but in reality there are two factors that are working in opposition. First is that the ETAK & TIGER line files address ranges do not match/align well with the parcel data. Second, the parcel data for Klamath County are registered to the GCDB system. The GCDB system provides 'good' registration in some locations, but can be 'poor' in others. So, the task of associating the x/y coordinate locations with parcel data in any meaningful way is problematic.

OIT was able to obtain a 'centerline' road file from the Klamath County offices that was generated from adjusting the county 911 roads (based on ETAK data) to align with the available parcel data. Geocoding addresses against this dataset would thus provide a better assessment of how well the geocoding process might work (even though the actual x/y coordinate locations of the points might still contain error due to the registration problem of the parcel dataset mentioned above).

In performing the geocoding process with this new dataset OIT found that although the street/parcel datasets were more in better alignment with each other, this process can not be used to generate the type of end product we are looking for. A fundamental assumption of this process is that the width of the lots along a street segment have some sense of uniformity since the geocoding process assumes a linear interpolation along the street segment. This was not found to be the case in a significant number of instances. There are other situations in which lots are assigned an address that does not correspond to the street it is on, thus again decreasing the utility of this approach.

These situations have led to simply geocode the parcel data on the SITUS field using the 'single field' option. A point file has been generated with the SITUS address based on label point locations. Out of a total of 62864 lots, 26766 have SITUS information. Roughly 3786 of the lots with no SITUS information and have an appraised improvement value greater than 0, meaning that it is possible that these lots might yet be addressable and can be pointed out to county personnel for possible examination/evaluation. Using the SITUS info from the map taxlot info has its own problems such as multiple lots with the same map taxlot number that might for instance be separated by an easement. In summary however, it looks like this method shows the most promise of generating the desired product.

We have also been working with the people involved in the initial assignment of addresses so that their product might be more adaptable to a GIS format in the future. This process seems to have been accepted by their office and we are moving forward with helping them convert/modify their process.

The next steps would involve refining this method to deal with the problems associated with generating an address point file in this way, e.g., so that multiple lots are not associated with the same address. Also, it would be beneficial if these point locations were aligned with the associated structure on the lot.

C-FIT Confidentiality (attached [GIS & Confidentiality Report.pdf](#))

Oregon C-FIT members prepared a confidentiality report that was presented to the Oregon Geographic Information Council in 2002. In addition, during the 2003 several legislative bills passed that impact confidentiality and data share in and among state, federal and local agencies.

2003-2004 Funding opportunities

If there are any potential projects that Cultural FIT wished to propose to OGIC this fall, please contact me and we can start to scope out projects with the appropriate focus. FIT data development should focus on establishing and maintaining publicly available base framework data. Resources matching (in grants and other sources) will allow the resources to go farther and fund more activities. If possible we should focus on the high priority layers (as identified above).

Implementation Plans (attached [Draft Cultural Implementation Plan.pdf](#))

Each FIT is responsible for developing implementation plans and metadata standards over the next several months and presenting this material statewide at the GIS data standards forums. This is going to be a fair amount of work and we need to coordinate these activities. Where possible, and it make sense, we will try to use the national standards (as per all of the other Oregon FIT standards development to date). One component of the Implementation plans will be the Content Standards. There is draft information available regarding the Addressing, Facilities and base level cultural data. I have attached the start of a draft Implementation for C-FIT and would any input that can be provided. More information is available on the FGDC data development at the web sites outlined below:

Address Content Standards

FGDC Draft Address Content Standard is posted at:

http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/status/sub2_4.html

and a pdf is available at:

http://www.census.gov/geo/www/standards/scdd/AddressStandardV2_April%2017_2003.pdf

Cy also provides an addressing standard that the State Of Kansas has adopted. It is in the attached [Kansas Addressing Standard.pdf](#)

Facilities Content Standard

The facilities Content Standards is posted at:

http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/documents/standards/facility_id/FACSTD12.PDF

Cultural Content Standard

The National Cultural FIT group is organized by the Census and they have information posted at:

<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/standards/scdd/>

Previously there was a FGDC Cultural Content Standards proposed but is now defunct.

The base level work is available at:

http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/status/sub2_5.html