Call to Order

1. Chair Bruce Dodds called the meeting to order shortly after 8:00 a.m.
   - The Board members introduced themselves.
2. Guests were asked to self-introduce.
**Brief Items and Reports**

1. **Approval of April 27, 2022 meeting minutes** - The minutes of the April 27, 2022 Survey Advisory Board meeting were approved on condition of making one amendment: Under Active Items, on the 4th bulleted line, the word “Records” will be changed to “Recorders”.

2. **Monument perpetuation and Professional Development Hours (PDH) program report** – David Icenhower reported that since the April 27th meeting:
   - 23 LCRs have been submitted
   - 155 Permits to Remove or Destroy have been submitted
   - 83 Completion reports have been submitted
   - One (1) Surveyor, Robert DeVink, is participating in the Professional Development Hours (PDH) Program. Robert is scheduled to visit the PLSO facilities to gain a better appreciation for the type and quantity of records that the PLSO has on-hand. A thumb drive has been delivered to Robert which contains scanned files that have not been appropriately named or indexed. Robert will name and sort these records into organized file folders.

3. **Washington State Association of County Auditors (WSACA) report** – Kim Eisenbacher and Vicky Dalton
   - Vicky reported that there is a plan to redact racially improper statements or conditions of approval from existing recorded maps. These maps will then be re-recorded with the original maps being sent to regional offices of State Archives. The originals should be available in perpetuity.

4. **SAB Liaison to WSACA report** – Gary Letzring
   - Gary reported that recorders request to make all recording information digital so that no handwriting is needed on any map.

5. **Report from Land Surveyors’ Association of Washington (LSAW) Liaison** – Tom Barger
   - Tom Barger was not present at the meeting and no report was given.

6. **Report from Washington Council of County Surveyors (WCCS) Liaison** – Sam Mutt
   - Sam Mutt was not in meeting attendance and no report was given.

7. **Status of the Did you know? Article**
• Gary Letzring reported that an article about physical description and history of found and/or replaced monuments is still in the works. He has shared the article with SAB members for comment.

8. **Update of GPS Guidebook 2004** –

• Bruce Dodds asked David to contact Martin Paquette to find out if he is still working on this project.

**DNR Report**

1. **02A Account report**

• Pat Beehler reported on the 02A account, **as attached**.

2. **Records** – David Icenhower reported:

• **Since the SAB meeting on April 27, the PLSO has indexed into WebXtender:**
  - 3,242 current surveys (recently recorded maps from the counties)
  - 3,018 back files (back-logged recorded maps)

• **Records donated** – The PLSO has:
  - Completed picking up records from Dobbs & Fox in Seattle.
  - Begun picking up some records from Jerry Olson.

• **Record collections waiting to be donated:**
  - **City of Bremerton** – Gunner Freedrick, PLS, has maps and field books.
  - **Sadler Barnard** – Ann is discussing details with them.

• **Records to potentially be acquired:**
  - David contacted Todd Pocock regarding **Harmsen records**. Harmsen is now owned by a group in Tennessee and he doesn't know if they will allow the donation. He is looking into it. (He thinks that most everything has been scanned and we can have digital files if the corporation will let him donate them). Todd was on vacation this week and an update is not available at this time.
  - Contacted Bob Wilson of San Juan Surveying who has the **Thalacker collection**. He is in the process of digitizing all (or a large portion of) those records and he wants to give them to us when he is finished. He asked that we call him again in 6 months to check in on the status.
3. Outreach/Training – David Icenhower reported:

- News and information sent via Mail Chimp
  - NGS Webinar Series: NGS Products and Services Update
  - NGS Webinar: GeMS Validation

- LSAW
  - Attended Board of Directors meeting in May
  - Scheduled to attend Inland Empire chapter meeting – August 11

Active Items (Working)

1. Outreach concerning monument destruction

- Discussion took place regarding the best way to disseminate monument preservation laws and methods and whether enforcement might be able to be stepped up.

- Prevailing thoughts discussed:
  - Enforcement is difficult and often ineffective. “Due process” laws hamper the ability of the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (BRPELS) to enforce minor issues.
  - Education is the key
  - We should ask the local jurisdictions what works for them
  - We could write a letter to some of the larger jurisdictions describing a “best practices” approach for how to preserve monuments.
  - When monuments show up on the plans, they have a way better chance of survival; therefore, the engineers need to understand the importance of showing existing monuments on the plans.
  - Enforcement can be effective if monument preservation is in the contract, making the contractor responsible.
  - Paul will write a letter to be sent to all jurisdictions explaining the acute need to preserve monuments in order to identify boundaries, both for private property owners as well as for their own jurisdictional land management. The letter will outline “best practices” for reviewing private and public plans with an eye toward monument preservation. The PLSO will send it out on DNR letterhead to all jurisdictions.

- 811 Washington – Tom Barger

  - Tom Barger was not in attendance and he did not submit a report.
  - Bruce stated that he doesn’t believe the 811 organization will ever accept the concept of treating monuments like utilities for locating purposes.
  - Paul believes that if the state would ever start a monument database, then we would have an “as-built” state-wide GIS map that could be used to help locate monuments. Right of
Way monuments could be located and mark up in the field by the applicable jurisdiction.

2. **Model BLA Ordinance** – Walt Dale reported:

   - Walt reported that the latest draft version of the Model BLA Ordinance is version 1.4
   - Sam Mutt sent out the latest version of the document to various stakeholder organizations, such as, realtors, planners, city, county, and land title associations, as well as the LSAW. There were a few comments received back which have been addressed and are incorporated in the current version 1.4.
   - Walt is trying to contact the business advisory council which advises the Director of Revenue. He wants to see if they might want to partner with SAB to help with the Model BLA document. Walt has attempted to contact them to see if they are interested.
   - If we cannot get more support, we may have to create a “Did You Know” article in lieu of a full-blown Model BLA Ordinance in an attempt to provide some form of education.
   - We need to distribute this document to as many surveyors as possible. Surveyors need to know the necessary steps to take in addition to local jurisdiction requirements in order to protect themselves and their clients. LSAW may be the best organization to disseminate this document to the widest surveyor audience.
   - Bruce plans to coordinate with the Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (BRPELS) regarding the content and planned usage of this document.

3. **Monument Preservation Legislation/PLSO Funding** - Pat Beehler

   - The DNR has a list of legislation that they want to introduce. In order to limit the competition with other bills, the DNR leadership has directed Pat to no longer spend DNR time and resources on the bill.

4. **Proposed revisions to RCW 58.09.100** – Pat Beehler reported:

   - Latest proposed revision is to make the county commissioner’s recording surcharge a set fee.
New Items

1. Bruce asked whether it is appropriate to include the depth of a monument in a legal description. Discussion took place with a consensus being that the inclusion of a monument depth is somewhat unusual, and in most cases not necessary, but also not always inappropriate.

2. Bruce also asked whether it is appropriate (legal?) for a survey firm to use caps that have more than one registration number printed on them. After discussion, Bob Morse said that he would talk with a surveyor who may have discussed this issue with the BRPELS, and Bruce will contact one of the BRPELS members to see if there has ever been a determination on this.

3. Gary Letzring mentioned that a city is having him pay prevailing wages for a crew who is tying and re-setting monuments. Discussion took place with no action taken.

4. Paul asked if BRPELS had answered the DNR/SAB’s questions posed to them. Neither the DNR nor the SAB have received any correspondence from BRPELS on this issue.

5. David briefed the board that the Application and Permit to Remove or Destroy a Survey Monument form has been slightly modified. Bob Morse asked if David could send out a Mail Chimp to help disseminate the fact that a revised version of this form exists.

Next Meeting Date

- The next meeting is planned for Thursday, October 27, 2022 at the DNR Tumwater complex.

Adjournment

- Bruce Dodds adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.
- Board lunch followed
# O2A - SURVEYS & MAPS ACCOUNT

## PLSO FY22 (Budget $830,500)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$78,485</td>
<td>$72,469.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$706,547</td>
<td>$85,878.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R - Fiscal Year to Date</td>
<td>$24,466</td>
<td>$87,128</td>
<td>$89,574</td>
<td>$94,343</td>
<td>$101,865</td>
<td>$119,667</td>
<td>$137,354</td>
<td>$126,131</td>
<td>$146,440</td>
<td>$155,199</td>
<td>$160,633</td>
<td>$163,090</td>
<td>$123,952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTUs</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>$869,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PLSO FISCAL YEAR TO DATE

| Revenue (Recording Fee) | $24,466 | $87,128 | $89,574 | $94,343 | $101,865 | $119,667 | $137,354 | $126,131 | $146,440 | $155,199 | $160,633 | $163,090 | $123,952 |
| Revenue - Expense | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $58,878.92 |

## PLSO EXCESS Percentage

| FY22 | 19% |

## PLSO BIENNIUM TO DATE

| Revenue (Recording Fee) | $54,019 | $57,081 | $65,122 | $60,474 | $66,363 | $53,076 | $53,599 | $66,678 | $47,392 | $56,193 | $60,318 | $65,958 | $706,547 |
| Revenue - Expense | $54,019 | $57,081 | $65,122 | $60,474 | $66,363 | $53,076 | $53,599 | $66,678 | $47,392 | $56,193 | $60,318 | $65,958 | $706,547 |
| PLSO EXCESS Percentage | 17% |

## PLSO 02A YTD ±

| PLSO Revenue | $78,485 | $119,744 | $67,568 | $65,244 | $74,157 | $70,878 | $71,286 | $55,455 | $67,701 | $64,952 | $65,752 | $68,416 | $869,637 |
| PLSO Expense | $54,019 | $57,081 | $65,122 | $60,474 | $66,363 | $53,076 | $53,599 | $66,678 | $47,392 | $56,193 | $60,318 | $65,958 | $706,547 |
| PLSO revenue - expense | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $24,466 | $58,878.92 |

## OFM Fund 02A Balance

| OFM Revenue Report | $78,485 | $119,744 | $67,568 | $65,244 | $74,157 | $70,878 | $71,286 | $55,455 | $67,701 | $64,952 | $65,752 | $68,416 | $869,637 |
| PLSO Expenses | $54,019 | $57,081 | $65,122 | $60,474 | $66,363 | $53,076 | $53,599 | $66,678 | $47,392 | $56,193 | $60,318 | $65,958 | $706,547 |
| Admin & Other Expenses | $54,019 | $57,081 | $65,122 | $60,474 | $66,363 | $53,076 | $53,599 | $66,678 | $47,392 | $56,193 | $60,318 | $65,958 | $706,547 |

## BTD Balance change

| BTD Balance change | $24,466 | $87,128 | $89,574 | $94,343 | $101,865 | $119,667 | $137,354 | $126,131 | $146,440 | $155,199 | $160,633 | $163,090 | $123,952 |

## BTD Percent Change

| BTD Percent Change | 4% | 13% | 13% | 14% | 15% | 17% | 18% | 17% | -3% | -2% | -6% | -6% |