

Public Review Comments and Responses for the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Parcel Data Transfer Standard V1.1



The Standards Committee of the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (GAC) held a public review period for proposed changes to version 1.0 of the GAC Parcel Data Transfer Standard from November 26, 2018 to January 11, 2019. Below is a table showing the comments received and responses from the Standards Committee, including resulting changes made to the standard and other actions.

Comment	Submitter	Standards Committee Response
Section 1. Identification Elements		
Could you force a standard of parcel numbers? I've noticed variability from county to county that could clear up headaches. Has a state parcel number been suggested? It may be easier to rename every parcel for a standard use.	Mackenzie Hogfeldt, Lake County	This standard only requires that parcel IDs be unique. Beyond that it is up to each county to decide how to construct their parcel identifiers based on their own business needs. More information about this topic can be found in this GCGI report from 1997 .
Section 2. Address Elements		
Our tax system uses a single line for a property address while yours uses 15 not including the zip code. It may be difficult if not impossible to accurately convert our one line address into 15 lines. I am not interested in supplying the address from our address point layer as I would like to be able to compare the tax parcel address against the address point layer for QAQC. Please consider adding a "nonstandard property address" field so the counties that cannot comply with your address format can still share data, or better yet share any scripts that will help convert the address from a one line field such as "236 MAIN ST W APT 1" to the correct format.	Mark Volz, Lyon County	Action: Ask key stakeholders that have implemented the standard to share any relevant data conversion scripts or processes. Action: Add this topic to a future best practices document.
The parcel data transfer standard only allows for a single address per parcel. Our current system allows for 3 addresses per parcel. I am not sure what you can do about this issue. Please consider adding a flag for to indicate that other addresses exist on the property, or specify in best practices how we should deal with this situation.	Mark Volz, Lyon County	This parcel standard is designed to have just one address per parcel. The GAC Address Points Data Standard is designed for a dataset to accommodate all addresses. The address points standard includes a Parcel Unique Identifier field in which the parcel associated with each address can be referenced. This will allow relating the address point data to the parcel data to identify all addresses associated with a parcel. Action: Add this topic to a future best practices document.

<p>Section 3. Area Elements</p>		
<p>A question for you guys on the validation piece of the new parcel data standard. I'm looking at the "Mandatory" "CTU_NAME" and "CTU_CODE" fields. We're wondering if there's really a need to populate those for "non-standard" parcels (i.e., parcels where "N_STANDARD" is populated)?</p> <p>The issue for us is that we have some of our right-of-way parcels that cross two, or more, municipal boundaries. In those cases, we can't really populate the "CTU_NAME" and "CTU_CODE" columns.</p> <p>Any guidance you can provide on handling those?</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	<p>Todd Lusk, Dakota County</p>	<p>Action: Change the standard to make these two fields Conditional instead of Mandatory, with the condition being that they do not need to be populated for polygons that cross municipal boundaries (e.g. large right-of-way polygons, lake polygons). Also stipulate for each of these fields that if it is not populated, the Non-Standard Parcel Status field must be populated.</p>
<p>Section 4. Tax and Survey Elements</p>		
<p>Under the definition of Conditional "Lot, Block, and Plat values must be populated for all platted properties." This is impossible to comply with when a single parcel is comprised of a part of a lot, multiple lots, or a part that is not a lot or outlot in a plat such as a vacated street. Our tax data only contains a lot value in it if and only if the parcel one whole and complete lot.</p>	<p>Mark Volz, Lyon County</p>	<p>Action: Make the following change to the language in the example given under Conditional:</p> <p>Example 1: Lot, Block and Plat values must be populated for all platted properties parcels that have coincident geometry with a specific lot, block and plat.; <u>however, they</u> These fields will be null for non-platted properties parcels. <u>Some of these fields may also be null in platted areas when a parcel boundary is not coincident with a specific lot.</u></p> <p>Action: Add this topic to a future best practices document.</p>
<p>Section 5. Ownership and Administration Elements</p>		
<p>I'm sorry that I missed this in the past, but I just realized you have added a section 5.1 "Ownership" to the data standard. please see the attached document. These values are what the TOD Office has been using within the Public Parcels datasets. We came up with these categories of ownership purely for the purpose of the Public Parcels project, so they are somewhat idiosyncratic for us.</p> <p>If there is any 'demand' for this category or it helps in any way, I would like to submit this list for future consideration or updates to the parcel data standard.</p>	<p>Clayton Watercott, Metro Transit</p>	<p>The suggested new ownership categories are similar to the existing categories in the standard but have some project specific differences. Because the existing categories were developed for a broad range of uses and have been vetted by a broad stakeholder group, we will keep the existing categories.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUNICIPAL: Includes most City-owned parcels (exceptions below) • COUNTY: County-owned parcels minus parks departments, where identifiable • STATE: all state agencies minus MN-DOT-owned parcels, where identifiable • STATE - MNDOT: all state-owned parcels that can be identified as MN-DOT specific (check Tax Name) • METROPOLITAN COUNCIL: all known divisions and iterations of the Metropolitan Council • EDUCATIONAL: all parcels owned by a public-school district, secondary school, or public college • FEDERAL: all parcels identified as Federally-owned • OTHER TRANSIT ORG: Metro-area public transit authorities other than Metro Transit • PARK/WATERSHED DISTRICT: parcels owned by a watershed district, regional park district, or large park boards (i.e. "Ramsey County Parks Dept." or "Minneapolis Park Board") 		
Section 6. Public Land Survey System Elements		
General Comments		
<p>I propose that "Transfer" be removed from the title. The address point standard and developing road centerline standard are also designed as transfer standards, but they do not include the word Transfer in the title, and thus the titles are not standardized. I know that "Transfer" was originally included in the title of the parcel standard to help communicate that it was not being mandated as a data collection or storage standard. I believe that the intro language to GAC standards now clearly describes that the GAC does not and cannot mandate them and that they are intended for data exchange. Thus, I believe that having "Transfer" in the title of one standard is no longer necessary.</p>	<p>Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council</p>	<p>Action: Change title from Parcel Data Transfer Standard to Parcel Data Standard</p>
<p>I have reviewed the proposed changes to the Parcel Data Transfer Standard and find them all reasonable and acceptable. Thank you to all who worked on these.</p>	<p>Mark Sloan, Clay County</p>	<p>none</p>