

Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
**Standards Committee +
Land Records & Parcel Committee**



PARCEL DATA TRANSFER STANDARD
Alignment Document (Version 2.0)

Reflecting comments gathered during the 90-Day Review Period:
October 24, 2016 – January 20, 2017

Originally published on March 9, 2017
Revised on April 4, 2017



**Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council
Standards Committee + Parcel & Land Records Committee
Alignment Document (Version 2.0) – April 4, 2017**

Table of Contents

Introduction 3
 Purpose of this document..... 3
 How to use this document..... 3
 Part 1 - COUNTY_ID & PIN 4
 Part 2 - Address Attributes 5
 Part 3.1 - Tax and Survey Attributes 9
 Part 4 - School District and Watershed District Attributes 22
 Part 3.2 - Tax and Survey Attributes 23
 Part 5 - Public Land Survey System (PLSS) Attributes 25
 Part 3.3 - Tax and Survey Attributes 26
 Appendix: Additional comments not specific to an attribute 28

***Please note:** The data standard attributes appear in the order in which they are listed in the present draft Parcel Data Transfer Standard. The order of these attributes may change as additional info is received from data producer and consumer stakeholders. (This is why there are Tax and Survey attributes seemingly out of order in the Table of Contents)*

Questions, comments, or concerns about this document can be directed to:

Geoffrey Maas, GISP
 Chair, Standards Committee
 MetroGIS Coordinator, Metropolitan Council
geoffrey.maas@metc.state.mn
 651.602.1638

Introduction. The Standards Committee of the Geospatial Advisory Council held a 90-day review period on the proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard. This document contains the comments and suggestions provided by the geospatial community in Minnesota during the review period (10/24/16 to 01/20/17) *edited to align with the individual attributes* of the proposed standard. Please refer to the **Comments Received on the proposed PARCEL DATA TRANSFER STANDARD** document (*with the green spine on the cover*) for the original comments as submitted by the members of the geospatial community of the state.



This document is available from the Standards Committee website on MnGeo's website. You can do a web search on: **Proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard for Minnesota** or use the URL: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/parcel_attrib/parcel_attrib.html

Purpose of this document

This document is intended to facilitate ease of interpretation and to align the comments received from the stakeholders with the specific attributes to which they reference.

How to use this document

Each proposed attribute is listed out and has its type, length, description and origin shown beneath it. Many attributes listed also have an example showing how the attributes would appear in either its context or in the database itself.

Attributes shown in **GRAY** did not receive any comments during the review period and are not anticipated to change as the standard is reviewed or continues to advance toward adoption.

Attributes shown in **Purple Italic** received specific comments during the review period with possible recommendations also listed.

Examples of attribute features may be shown in a variety of colors to highlight their order, placement, or use.

Part 1 – County ID and PIN

COUNTY_ID

Description: Unique County ID, three-character FIPS code
Type: Text
Length: 3
Example: Aitkin County would use **001**, Anoka County would use **003**, etc.
Origin: Auto-calculated
(No comments received on COUNTY_ID)

PIN

Description: Unique Parcel ID comprised of **COUNTY_ID** + **hyphen** + **County PIN**
Type: Text
Length: 25
Example: A parcel in Aitkin County would use **001-29-0-055902**
Origin: Tax System

Comments on PIN:

County PINs range in value from 9 characters to 17 characters, PIN needs to be wide enough to accommodate adding the prefix; Change PIN to STATE_PIN for clarification that this is the statewide PIN (with County ID appended to front)

Initial Recommendations:

*Change the name of this attribute to **STATE_PIN**
Make length **30 characters wide** to accommodate any potential PIN size*

Part 2 – Address Attributes

The following attributes are collectively known as the **'Address Attributes'** in that they all relate to the address of the parcel. These **'Address Attributes'** will likely align more closely with the forthcoming Address Point Data Transfer Standard, pending its development, review and approval by the statewide geospatial professional community.

BLDG_NUM

Description: House Number, building or house number of the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 10
Example: **1119** 22nd Ave NE
Origin: Tax System and Local Addressing Authority

For the fields that pertain to the physical address of a parcel, many counties may have a single physical address field as part of the existing tax download, which is the concatenated address, but do not have the individual fields separated in the download processes. The county may have to run some sort of address splitter (atomization) process to accomplish this.

'Building Number' is not a term applicable to working with parcel data, the correct term is 'situated address', which refers to the legally designated address of the parcel and may (or may not) be related to the actual addresses posted on the buildings within that parcel.

PREFIX_DIR

Description: Street prefix direction for the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 2
Example: **N** Main St
Origin: Tax System/USPS domain list

PREFIXTYPE

Description: Street prefix type
Type: Text
Length: 6
Example: **Hwy** 65
Origin: Tax System/USPS domain list

STREETNAME

Description: Street name for the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 40
Example: N Main St
Origin: Tax System and Local Addressing Authority

STREETTYPE

Description: Street type abbreviation
Type: Text
Length: 4
Example: N Main St
Origin: Tax System/USPS domain list

Comments on STREETTYPE

This attribute is set to only four (4) characters in width, there may be additional values not in the USPS list of domain values (e.g. "Alcove") that cannot be accommodated.

Initial Recommendations:

Expand the width to 6 characters and use the USPS domain list with local additions as needed

SUFFIX_DIR

Description: Street Suffix Direction
Type: Text
Length: 2
Example: Main St N
Origin: Extrapolated from Tax System/Derived from Centerlines?

UNIT_INFO

Description: Unit information
Type: Text
Length: 12
Example: 1500 Skylark St N, **Suite 13**
Origin: Tax System/Derived from Centerlines

Comments on UNIT_INFO

How can this attribute be used to effectively handle multi-unit parcels like apartments, condominium, and multi-family dwelling units? Perhaps carrying a primary unit number, or a multiple. Many cities and counties have unique PINs for each unit in a condominium; these parcels are stacked on each other, other agencies like my county use only one parcel for a whole building.

Consider expanding the length from 12 to 15 to match the 911 standard.

Initial Recommendation:

Development of a 'Best Practice' for a consistent solution for handling multiple units within a single parcel. See Comment A in the appendix of this document;

CITY

Description: City (actual), the name of the city or township in which the parcel resides
This may differ from CITY_USPS (mailing address)
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System

Comments on CITY

Consider expanding the length from 30 to 100 to match the 911 standard.

CITY_USPS

Description: City (mailing), the name of the mailing address city for the parcel as defined by the United States Postal Service (USPS)
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System, USPS data

Comments on CITY_USPS

Consider expanding the length from 30 to 40 to match the 911 standard.

ZIP

Description: ZIP Code for the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 5
Example: **55418**
Origin: Tax System, USPS data

ZIP4

Description: ZIP 4 Extension for the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 4
Example: **3848**
Origin: Tax System, USPS data

Part 3.1 - Tax and Survey Attributes

The following attributes are collectively known as the 'Tax and Survey Attributes' in that they all relate to specific aspects of the surveyor office and tax system as the origin of the data.

PLAT_NAME

Description: Legal description plat name
Type: Text
Length: 50
Example: EAST SIDE ADDITION TO MINNEAPOLIS
Origin: Tax System

Comments on PLAT_NAME

*Some counties will have plat names longer than 50 characters
Many counties have plat names that exceed 100 characters*

Recommendation:

Change PLAT_NAME length to 150 characters

BLOCK

Description: Legal description of block identifier within the plat
Type: Text
Length: 5
Example: 13
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on BLOCK)

LOT

Description: Legal description of lot number within the block
Type: Text
Length: 5
Example: 7
Origin: Tax System

Comments on LOT

This attribute is currently set at five (5) characters. Recommend changing this to eight (8) characters in length to accommodate additional descriptors such as 'OUTLOT A'

Initial Recommendation:

Determine a suitable length for the LOT attribute that is larger than five (5)

ACRES_POLY

Description: The calculated polygon acreage within the geospatial data
Type: Double
Length: 11 (2 decimals)
Origin: Calculated from geometry
(No comments received on ACRES_POLY)

ACRES_DEED

Description: The deeded acreage of the parcel
Type: Double
Length: 11 (2 decimals)
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on ACRES_DEED)

USE1_DESC

Description: Use Type 1 (description of land use type 1)
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Entered by County

Comments on USE1_DESC

This terminology Use Description (USE_DESC) is not ideal from an assessor's standpoint and may lead to confusion. A better option would be CLASS. An end user may not distinguish between zoning and tax classification.

Initial Recommendation:

Change USEx_DESC to CLASSx_DESC

USE2_DESC

Description: Use Type 2 (description of land use type 2)
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Entered by County

See comment for USE1_DESC

USE3_DESC

Description: Use Type 3 (description of land use type 3)
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Entered by County

See comment for USE1_DESC

USE4_DESC

Description: Use Type 4 (description of land use type 4)
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Entered by County

See comment for USE1_DESC

MULTI_USES

Description: Multiple Uses
Type: Text
Length: 1
Domain: Y/N to indicate if multiple uses exist
(No comments received on MULTI_USES)

LANDMARK

Description: Name of the predominant landmark or business on this parcel
Type: Text
Length: 100
Example: Minneapolis Fire Station 15
Origin: Entered by County/Possible Extrapolation from Tax System

Comments on LANDMARK

Consider expanding length to 150 character to match 911

Initial Recommendation:

Expand length to 150 characters

OWNER_NAME

Description: Full name of the owner. Format is last name first where available
Inclusion of multiple owners is optional

Type: Text

Length: 100

Example: **WINDOM, WILLIAM H**

Origin: Tax System

Comments on OWNER_NAME:

Could fields be added to carry just first name (OWNER_F_NAME) and last name (OWNER_L_NAME)?

Initial Recommendation:

First name and last name can be extracted from OWNER_NAME

OWNER_MORE

Description: Additional Owner Name (e.g. joint owner or additional first-name-first format)

Type: Text

Length: 100

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on OWNER_MORE)

OWN_ADD_L1

Description: Owner Address Line 2
Mailing address of the owner. Up to three lines may be used.
Typically line 1 is street address, line 2 is the city, state, zip, but other variations exist;

Type: Text

Length: 100

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on OWN_ADD_L1)

OWN_ADD_L2

Description: Owner Address Line 2

Type: Text

Length: 100

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on OWN_ADD_L2)

OWN_ADD_L3

Description: Owner Address Line 3
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on OWN_ADD_L3)

OWN_ADD_L4

Description: Owner Address Line 4
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on OWN_ADD_L4)

TAX_NAME

Description: Taxpayer name, the full first and last name of the taxpayer
The format (e.g. last name first or last name last) and inclusion of multiple taxpayer names is up to each data provider
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_NAME)

TAX_ADD_L1

Description: Taxpayer Address Line 1, mailing address of the taxpayer. Up to three lines may be used.
Typically line 1 is street address, line 2 is the city, state, zip, but other variations exist;
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_ADD_L1)

TAX_ADD_L2

Description: Taxpayer Address Line 2
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_ADD_L2)

TAX_ADD_L3

Description: Taxpayer Address Line 3
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_ADD_L3)

TAX_ADD_L4

Description: Taxpayer Address Line 4
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_ADD_L4)

OWNERSHIP

Description: Generalized ownership condition of the parcel
Type: Text
Length: 5
Domain: 01 – Federal
02 – State
03 – County Fee
04 – Tax Forfeit
05 – Municipal
06 – Tribal
07 – Regional Government
08 – Port Authority
97 – Unknown
98 – No Value
99 – Private

Origin: County

Question:

Are there additional categories that are needed/desired for this attribute?

Additionally, the counties of the Arrowhead Region have begun to assembled variables for an Administrative (ADMIN_OWN) attribute which specifies the specific agency within an Ownership category, for example:

OWNERSHIP	ADMIN_OWN
02	DNR
02	DOT

HOMESTEAD

Description: Homestead status
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System
Domain: Y = Yes, N = No, P = Partial (these were originally proposed)

Comments on HOMESTEAD

The current proposed input choices are 'Yes', 'No' and 'Partial'. No one describes a fractional homestead as 'partial' so use 'F' for fractional instead. This way GIS staff and assessors are using the same terminology.

Initial Recommendation: Replace 'P' (Partial) with 'F' (Fractional)

*There is also the potential to match the **State of Minnesota Classification of Property** list of domains, page 72 of: http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/local_gov/prop_tax_admin/education/ptamanual_module3.pdf*

<u>Code</u>	<u>Value</u>
1a	Residential homestead
1b	Blind/Disabled homestead
1c	Commercial-Seasonal residential recreational
2a	Agricultural homestead
2b	Rural vacant land
2c	Managed forest lands
2d	Private airport
2e	Commercial aggregate deposit
3a	Commercial-Industrial
4a	Rental housing
4b(1)	Residential non-homestead, 1-3 units
4b(2)	Unclassified manufactured Home
4b(3)	Agricultural non-homestead residents, 2-3 units
4b(4)	Unimproved residential land
4bb	Residential Non-Homestead Single Unit; incl. on ag land
4c	Season Residential Recreational Commercial (Resort)
4c(2)	Qualifying Golf Course
4c(3)(i)	Non-profit community services (non-revenue)
4c(3)(ii)	Non-profit community services (donations)
4c(4)	Post-secondary student housing
4c(5)(i)	Manufactured housing park
4c(5)(ii)	Manufactured housing park; > 50% Owner Occupied
4c(5)(iii)	Manufactured housing park; 50% or less Owner Occupied
4c(6)	Metro Non-Profit Recreational Property
4c(7)	Certain Non-Comm. Aircraft Hangars and Land (leased land)
4c(8)	Certain Non-Comm. Aircraft Hangars and Land (private land)
4c(9)	Bed & Breakfast
4c(10)	Seasonal Restaurant on a lake
4c(11)	Marina
4d	Low income rental housing (per unit)

Note these designations have the potential to change as the tax law changes;

EMV_LAND

Description: Estimated Market Value of Land

Type: Integer

Length: Long

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on EMV_LAND)

EMV_BLDG

Description: Estimated Market Value of Buildings

Type: Integer

Length: Long

Values: Dollars, rounded to nearest dollar; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on EMV_BLDG)

EMV_TOTAL

Description: Estimated Market Value, Total

Type: Integer

Length: Long

Values: Dollars, rounded to nearest dollar; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value

Origin: Calculated from EMV_LAND + EMV_BLDG

(No comments received on EMV_TOTAL)

TAX_YEAR

Description: Year of tax values, 4-digit year;

Type: Integer

Length: Short

Example: 2017

0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on TAX_YEAR)

MARKET_YEAR

Description: Year of market assessment, 4-digit year;
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Example: 2017
0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System

Comments on MARKET_YEAR

Name of attribute (MARKET_YEAR) is 11 characters, shapefiles are limited to 10 characters in length.

Initial Recommendation:

Consider renaming the attribute MKT_YEAR to facilitate its use in shapefiles

TAX_CAPAC

Description: Tax Capacity of the parcel
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Dollars, rounded to nearest dollar; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on TAX_CAPAC)

TOTAL_TAX

Description: Total tax of the parcel
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Dollars, rounded to nearest dollar; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System

Comments on TOTAL_TAX

Does this attribute refer to the total taxable value of the property (this could be different than the EMV) or does this refer to the amount of property tax to be paid?

SPEC_ASSES

Description: Special assessments value due payable in the current year
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Dollars, rounded to nearest dollar; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on SPEC_ASSES)

TAX_EXEMPT

Description: Tax exempt status
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System
Domain: Y = Yes, N = No

Comments on TAX_EXEMPT

The TAX_EXEMPT field has a Yes or No input but there can be parcels that have both tax exempt and non-tax exempt classifications – such as ag. containment buildings, native prairies and many more. This field could be difficult based on partial qualification. Can this attribute be used to handle PILT lands (Payment in lieu of taxes)?

Other domain values might be needed such as PART (partial), PILT (payment in lieu of taxes),

Initial Recommendation:

Consider adding other domain values to accommodate partial, PILT or other needed categories to represent tax exempt conditions.

XUSE1_DESC

Description: Description of exempt use type 1
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on XUSE1_DESC)

XUSE2_DESC

Description: Description of exempt use type 2
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on XUSE2_DESC)

XUSE3_DESC

Description: Description of exempt use type 3
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on XUSE3_DESC)

XUSE4_DESC

Description: Description of exempt use type 4
Type: Text
Length: 100
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on XUSE4_DESC)

DWELL_TYPE

Description: Dwelling type (e.g. single-family, multi-family, duplex, etc.)
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on DWELL_TYPE)

HOME_STYLE

Description: Home style description (e.g. rambler, split entry, etc.)
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on HOME_STYLE)

FIN_SQ_FT

Description: Finished square footage
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Integer, rounded to nearest sq. ft.; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on FIN_SQ_FT)

GARAGE

Description: Presence of garage (Y/N)
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on GARAGE)

GARAGESQFT

Description: Garage square footage
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Integer, rounded to nearest sq. ft.; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on GARAGESQFT)

BASEMENT

Description: Presence of basement (Y/N)
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on BASEMENT)

HEATING

Description: Type of heating in use
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on HEATING)

COOLING

Description: Type of cooling in use
Type: Text
Length: 30
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on COOLING)

YEAR_BUILT

Description: Year built
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Values: Integer (year, 4 digits); 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on YEARBUILT)

NUM_UNITS

Description: Number of residential units
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value
Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on NUM_UNITS)

SALE_DATE

Description: Date of last sale
Type: Date
Length: 8
Origin: Tax System

Comments on SALE_DATE

What is the preferred format for dates in this standard?

Examples for potential date treatment:

- *01/15/2001 - This is easy to read format; however, it requires 10 characters.*
- *20010115 – This format is easy to use for sorting, but it may be harder to read.*
- *Whatever format the data already has in the tax database;*
- *Other options*

Initial Recommendation:

Use the eight-digit date format 20010115 consistently

SALE_VALUE

Description: Value at last sale
Type: Integer
Length: Long
Values: Integer, rounded to nearest sq. ft.; 0 = No value; -9999 = No data or null value

Comments on SALE_VALUE

*Are we referring to the market value or the actual sale price?
Should both potentially be included?*

Existing attribute represents the value at the last sale;

Is there a business need to be satisfied by also carrying an attribute for current market value of the property if such data is available? (Estimated Market Value?)

Part 4 – Additional Attributes

The following attributes are collectively known as the *'Additional Attributes'*

SCHOOL_DST

Description: School district, unique school district number as defined by the MN Dept. of Education;

Type: Text

Length: 10

Origin: Minnesota Department of Education

(No comments received on SCHOOL_DST)

WSHD_DST

Description: Watershed district or watershed management organization name;

Type: Text

Length: 50

Origin: County to spatially join information into parcel data (?)

(No comments received on WSHD_DIST)

Part 3.2 - Tax and Survey Attributes

The following attributes are also sourced from tax system data.

GREEN_ACRE

Description: Green Acres Status (Y/N)
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: *Is this tracked in the tax system?*

Comments on GREEN_ACRE

Is the GREEN_ACRE attribute the right place to maintain Rural Preserve status information?

OPEN_SPACE

Description: Open Space Status (Y/N)
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on OPEN_SPACE)

AG_PRESERV

Description: Agricultural Preserve Status (Y/N)
Type: Text
Length: 1
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on AG_PRESERV)

AGPRE_ENRD

Description: Agricultural Preserve Enrolled Date
Type: Date
Length: 8
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on AGPRE_ENRD)

AGPRE_EXPD

Description: Agricultural Preserve Expiration Date
Type: Date
Length: 8
Origin: Tax System
(No comments received on AGPRE_EXPD)

PARC_CODE

Description: Parcel polygon to parcel point PIN relationship ('pointer')
This field is used to provide information about the relationship between parcel polygons, parcel points and unique tax parcel identifiers (PINs).

Type: Integer

Length: Short

Origin: Tax System

(No comments received on PARC_CODE)

Part 5 – Public Land Survey System (PLSS) Attributes

SECTION

Description: PLSS Section Number
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Origin: Tax System, PLSS
(No comments received on SECTION)

TOWNSHIP

Description: PLSS Township Number
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Origin: Tax System, PLSS
(No comments received on TOWNSHIP)

RANGE

Description: PLSS Range Number
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Origin: Tax System, PLSS
(No comments received on RANGE)

RANGE_DIR

Description: PLSS Range Direction
Type: Integer
Length: Short
Origin: Tax System, PLSS

Existing Domain Values: 0 = west;
 1 = east (applies only in Cook County);
 2 = west half-township or west half-range

Recommended Domain Values: 0 = west;
 1 = east (applies only in Cook County);
 2 = west half-township
 3 = west half-range

Part 3.3 - Tax and Survey Attributes

The following attributes are also sourced from tax system data.

LEGAL_DESC

Description: Abbreviated legal description
Type: Text
Length: 256
Origin: Tax System

Comments on LEGAL_DESC

*It would be more suitable to use **Tax Description** than **Legal Description** (TAX_DESC instead of LEGAL_DESC). GIS terminology should work to match the terms used by assessors and surveyors, so there is not mistake or misinterpretation in what they are working with. Caution should be used when applying the word legal, this has the potential to cause misunderstandings*

Initial Recommendations:

Convert name of LEGAL_DESC to TAX_DESC, field width to be 254

**Consider reducing length from 256 to 255 so it is compliant with DBF4.
Some software may limit field to 254 characters;**

EDIT_DATE

Description: Maintenance Date of Parcel; the date on which the spatial or tabular data for an individual parcel was last updated or edited;
Type: Date
Length: 8
Origin: Tax System

Comments on EDIT_DATE

*For tabular tax information, this is going to very difficult since there are many tables in a tax system. Would it be acceptable to just provide the date the last time the entire spatial data was updated? It might be better to call this **PUB_DATE**, as the attributes are all coming into the parcel data at different dates. This date represents when it was published in its entirety as a geospatial dataset.*

Recommendation: Rename the attribute PUB_DATE as the date provided represents the last time the geospatial dataset was published.

Examples for potential date treatment:

- *01/15/2001 - This is easy to read format; however, it requires 10 characters.*
- *20010115 – This format is easy to use for sorting, but it may be harder to read.*
- *Whatever format the data already has in the tax database;*
- *Other options*

Initial Recommendation: Use the eight-digit date format 20010115 consistently

EXPORT_DATE

Description: Export Date of the Polygon
The date the entire dataset was exported from the producer's GIS for external delivery;
Type: Date
Length: 8
Origin: Tax System

Comments on EXPORT_DATE

Name of attribute (EXPORT_DATE) is 11 characters, shapefiles are limited to 10 characters in length.

Initial Recommendation:

*Change name of attribute to EXP_DATE
Use the **eight-digit date format (20010115) consistently***

ORIG_PIN

Description: County unaltered parcel ID used to reference county information and documents
Type: Text
Length: 25
Origin: Tax System

Comments on ORIG_PIN

*Could a field be added to carry just the County PIN without the prefix?
ORIG_PIN has been added to the standard to meet this need;*

Convert the proposed PIN to STATE_PIN

The original unaltered PIN (without the appended prefix) which is presently ORIG_PIN should instead be COUNTY_PIN

Additional comments that are not specific to an existing attribute:

(A) Handling Multiple Property Addresses;

A more formal and approved method for handling multiple property addresses is needed; there are no directions on how to handle multiple dwellings on a parcel. This is concerning because the end user may assume 1 dwelling and be using info from 1 of multiple dwellings on a parcel to make conclusions. In the metro parcel data, this has been handled, in part, through maintaining a point layer with the parcel attributes; many unique, individual points (representing apartments, condos, etc.)

*Incorporating an additional attribute such as **FLOOR** for stacked parcels (condos, apartments, multi-family, etc.) might help address this need.*

Will the state accept more than 1 property address per parcel? Many current county systems support up to three property addresses for a single parcel, and in some cases, even that is not enough.

Recommendation:

Standards Committee develop a Best Practices Manual Reference for handling multiple properties/interests on a single parcel for the review and comment of the data creator and consume community to review.

(B) Scripting for translation from County data format to State Standard Format;

Many respondents requested the availability of translation scripts to help facilitate conversion of data from County Format to Parcel Data Transfer Standard format for counties who wish to translate their data and send it in. MNDNR is working on a Python script to potentially assist counties in doing so once the standard is finalized and adopted. A Python script to assist counties in putting their data into the proposed standard is being developed and tested. This script can be made available on the Geospatial Commons once a final Standard is adopted.

A method is needed to define valid or invalid nulls, once aggregating starts. Not all counties may have valid data for all fields. Having a trimmed or slimmed data set may be one approach to solving this.

Recommendation:

Development of a 'no-wrong-door' set of paths and resources for counties. Scripts, clear workflow paths, state and regional agency resources, etc.

(C) Is there a business need to carry attributes related to ditches in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard?

Suggested additions:

DITCH_VAL Ditch assessment value

DITCH_ID ID number for ditches (state, county, judicial, etc.)

Discussion point:

Is there a business need for this? Is this meaningfully linked to the tax data, land use data? Should this data be carried exclusively in the ditch dataset?

(D) Is there a business need and/or method for the inclusion of right-of-way alignments or untaxed lands with non-unique PINs?

Recommendation:

This spills into document management territory, likely has no way of being carried in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard;

(E) Some of the attributes being asked for are not necessarily a part of the current tax download processes, it would be desirable to devise some sort of timeline for meeting the standards for primary and secondary field incorporation. This will allow counties the time to devise a plan and implement the necessary accommodations in regards to the tax download processes.

Point of Discussion:

There is no timeline expectation or compliance requirement for the adoption, implementation and usage of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard;

(F) Is it expected that there will be a standard coordinate system that is going to be preferred with the data delivery?

Point of Discussion:

There has not been a standard coordinate system identified for a statewide integrated parcel set to date. In the metro region UTM Zone 15 is in use. Other areas of the state are using a variety of options (Lambert Conic Conformal, Transverse Mercator, State Plan (N, C, S), etc.)

When UTM 15 is extended over the entire state, it is referred to as UTM Zone 15E.

(G) Who is expected to pay for the modifications that will be needed to adjust the tax download processes to fulfill the standard requirements, and will there be any state money supplied to assist towards this?

Point of Discussion:

The Parcel Data Transfer Standard is not a mandate to county governments to perform any action to their processing or data creation actions.

(H) Trimmed/Slimmed Version of the dataset

Trimmed attribute version/slimmed set requested by several respondents;

Point of Discussion:

A 'slimmed' version of the dataset is viewed as a valuable resource.

(I) Availability of a service containing standardized parcel data

A service offering the standardized parcel data was requested by several respondents;

Point of Discussion:

A 'slimmed' version of the dataset is viewed as a valuable resource.

(J) Data relevance and usefulness concerns

Many of the state's agencies have parcel data they have created or received from counties; however, the data is gathered at different times, and the information changes quickly enough throughout a year that unless all gathered data was from the same date, it will not be as impactful or even useful. Even with consistent standards across agencies, the inconsistent timing of data inputs from various sources can paint an unreliable picture. Finally, a lot of the parcel information included in the proposed standards goes beyond what we would conceive as the norm for typical researchers and analysts. We question whether the minutiae of data is relevant to a wide audience, and thus worth standardizing in this manner. Standardization of this data could provide a high cost with limited benefit.

Point of Discussion:

A statewide cadaster would not be able to reflect every parcel change in 'real-time' however, a resource that is updated once a year or potentially quarterly would be very valuable to satisfy many needs in government, private sector, non-profit and academic usage.

(K) Acceptable data formats for submittal

There is no mention of what format the data should be provided in by the counties to the state, a preferred method should be identified, with a range of additional acceptable formats also identified.

Point of Discussion:

A list of acceptable formats for data has not been definitively identified.

(L) Use of alias field names

Are there any provision for or specifications regarding the use Alias field names? Would it be acceptable to have them match what is in the tax system instead of this standard?

Point of Discussion:

*Use of **database names** would be the approach preferred for data in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard. Counties or vendors serving counties would maintain the data in whatever*

(M) Concerns about the size/volume

There are potential performance implications in having too many attributes in a parcel dataset. There is a business need for a trimmed or slimmed down version of the data that removes many of the columns that only meet a small or specialized set of business cases. For example, such a “slim set” could include the first set of address columns up to “ZIP4”, then the set of Owner and Tax columns from “OWNER_NAME” through “TAX_ADD_L4”. These 24 columns would likely meet, by themselves, about 80% of the business needs in the community. If this were successful, then theoretically the standard could be modified in the future to set the remaining 54 columns aside in a separate table, linked by PIN, to be picked and chosen by the users as they desired.

Point of Discussion:

A ‘slimmed’ version of the dataset is viewed as a valuable resource.

(N) Incorporation of MSAG data

Is there a role or place for the incorporation of MSAG data in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard?

Out of scope:

While many 911 datasets are used in conjunction with parcel data; carrying MSAG attribution is out-of-scope for the Parcel Data Transfer Standard. MSAG attribution is better carried in road centerline or address point datasets for 911 uses.

(O) Implementation of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard

How should the parcel standard be implemented? Should the data creator (County) or the data user(s) do the conversion into the Standard? Some counties will be well positioned (resources and staff) to perform the transformation, while others may wish to but lack resources. Still others may be reluctant to perform the transformation as they may not have a business need for the data in the Parcel Data Transfer Standard format.

Only state agencies, when transferring data between one another, are compelled to use the standard. In cases where a state agency's databases include parcel data, that agency must be capable of creating an export dataset consistent with this standard for exchanging data between organizations. Agencies may continue to structure and store data using alternate data schemas as they see fit, provided the capability exists to readily output a format that complies with this standard if requested to do so by a data sharing partner. It is recommended that agencies integrate this standard into new database designs whenever possible.

One of the potential responsibilities of the state is to develop processes and code to convert county formats into standard formats and to then share those processes and code with the counties, so eventually they can perform transformations locally with ease.

(P) The ordering and arrangement of attributes in the standard and the dataset

Adjust the order the attributes are in the dataset help facilitate easier use. The following attributes should all be next to each other in the standard and resulting dataset:

PLAT_NAME
BLOCK
LOT
ACRES_POLY
ACRES_DEED
SECTION
TOWNSHIP
RANGE
RANG_DIR
LEGAL_DESC

Perhaps consider ordering the attributes from geographically smallest to largest:

LOT
BLOCK
PLAT
SECTION
TOWNSHIP
RANGE

*Consider organizing the data so that **ACRES_POLY** and **ACRES_DEED** down by the assessment data attributes.*

Consider organizing **USEx_DESC** attributes and **MULTI_USES** to be next to the Exempt Uses attributes.

Consider moving the tax payer and owner attributes closer to the beginning.

Consider moving **PIN** and **ORIG_PIN** so they are next to each other.

When a county submits its data to the state for aggregation, will the order it receives the attributes matter?

(Q) Addition of a Tillage Acreage and Tillage Value attribute

Is there potential to add attributes to handle Tillable Acreage and Tillable Value to the standard?

(R) Alignment with other standards

There are noticeable differences between the proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard and the standards being developed to meet the needs of 911, especially in how they handle address data.

Recommendation:

Publication and review of a candidate Address Point Standard by the geospatial community of Minnesota prior to adoption of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard. This work is underway with a review period anticipated in 2017.

(S) Inclusion of other data in the parcel feature class

Counties exhibit a wide range of feature they include in their features classes. How will this standard accommodate parcel (or parcel equivalent objects) including:

- Lakes, Rivers (as polygons) and other bodies of water represented as polygons
- Road polygons and rights-of-way;
- State lands with a non-unique PIN

Recommendation:

Further discussion and review by the Land Records and Parcel Committee and Standards Committee is needed on these and other specific issues.