Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council

Standards Committee

**Comments received on the proposed
PARCEL DATA TRANSFER STANDARD**

90-Day Review Period:
October 24, 2016 – January 20, 2017

January 27, 2017

Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Standards Committee
Comments Received on the Proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard
October 24, 2016 – January 20, 2017

Table of Contents

Special thanks are due to the following individuals for their contributions to the compilation of this document and the facilitation of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard review period.

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
Nancy Rader, Minnesota Geospatial Information Office
Sally Wakefield, Minnesota Geospatial Information Office
George Meyer, Otter Tail County; Chair, Parcel and Land Records Committee
Bart Richardson, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Questions or comments 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

Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Standards Committee
Comments Received on the Proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard
October 24, 2016 – January 20, 2017

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. The review period began on Monday, October 24, 2016 through Friday, January 20, 2017.

Overview. Digital parcel data is a core geospatial infrastructure dataset containing a wealth of valuable information about land division, land value and numerous other locational and descriptive attributes related to land parcels. It is a foundational building block for government services at all levels. Additionally, the work of private sector interests (e.g., utilities, real estate, engineering), non-profits and academia are greatly enhanced and more efficient with the availability of standardized parcel data.

In Minnesota, digital parcel data originates from the work of **county governments** to approve and record land division and to support the work flow of tax collection and tax administration. County governments are the **authoritative source** of the digital parcel data in Minnesota; all parcel data consumers are dependent upon the work of counties for this important geospatial data resource.

Resources available to stakeholder community. To facilitate review of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard several resources were made available from the Minnesota Geospatial Information Office, these included:

- The Proposed Draft Standard document (5 pages, PDF);
- A Frequently Asked Questions document (7 pages, PDF);
- A sample file geodatabase template;
- A sample dataset (one Congressional township in Anoka County) in the proposed standard;
- Metadata for the sample dataset;
- Instructions as to how and where to direct comments on the proposed standard;

All these resources can be found here:

Proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard for Minnesota, v.2 - Public Review
http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/parcel_attrib/parcel_attrib.html

RANDY LAHR, STEARNS COUNTY ASSESSORS OFFICE, ON BEHALF OF THE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF ASSESSING OFFICERS (MAAO) GIS COMMITTEE: RECEIVED JAN 20, 2017

Many of the fields are typical fields in a parcel dataset so there should not be issues;

Some of the fields or inputted choices are asking for a certain dataset from what I believe is an assessors standpoint but using the incorrect terminology and could lead to confusion. Examples are: USE1_DESC, USE2_DESC, USE3_DESC, USE4_DESC – which I believe is classification, why not CLASS1_DESC and etc.   The main concern is that the end user may not distinguish between zoning and tax classification.

Another one is HOMESTEAD. The input choices are "Yes", "No" and "Partial". No one describes a fractional homestead as partial why not use "F" for Fractional? This way GIS and assessor professionals speak the same language.

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 to flood based on partial qualification.

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.

JENNIFER WARD, PRO-WEST & ASSOCIATES, INC: RECEIVED JAN 20, 2017

We have had internal conversations regarding this, and we have spoken with a few of our county clients. There seems to be a general consensus that the majority of counties are more than willing to provide data. The main concern stems from the additional attributes that are being asked for and the fact that they are not all necessarily part of current tax download processes.

We would like to suggest making this a two-part effort. Step one consisting of "primary" fields being part of the initial standard requirements and then step two consisting of those "secondary" fields that a majority of the counties we work with will need time to adjust current processes that are in place to fulfill the proposed standards. We would also like to suggest devising timelines 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.

In general, the fields below are those that the majority of our county clients already have included as part of the existing tax download processes and are more easily incorporated into a parcel data standards. In many cases, the field names or lengths are not the same, but it would take minimal alteration of existing processes to adjust these. Obviously, this will vary from county to county, some may have a few more fields readily available than others in the existing tax processes, depending on the tax vendor that is being used.

COUNTY_ID (This can be auto-calculated)
PIN (This can be auto-calculated)
CITY_USPS
PLAT_NAME
BLOCK
LOT
ACRES_POLY (This can be auto-calculated)
ACRES_DEED
OWNER_NAME
OWNER_MORE
OWN_ADD_L1
OWN_ADD_L2
OWN_ADD_L3
OWN_ADD_L4
TAX_NAME
TAX_ADD_L1
TAX_ADD_L2
TAX_ADD_L3
TAX_ADD_L4
EMV_LAND
EMV_BLDG
EMV_TOTAL
TAX_YEAR
MARKET_YEAR
SCHOOL_DIST
SECTION
TOWNSHIP

RANGE
RANG_DIR
LEGAL_DESC
EDIT_DATE
EXPROT_DATE (This can be auto-calculated)
ORIG_PIN

For the fields that pertain to the physical address of a parcel, many of the counties we work with 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 process to accomplish this. Additionally, many of the parcels located in rural counties do not have a physical address assigned to them if there is not a structure located on it (farm fields, pasture lands, etc.).

The OWNERSHIP field may be difficult to obtain, we believe that a process to use the classification codes with a lookup table to determine what type it is may be necessary.

A couple of additional questions that came up:

1. Can classification code be used for the USE_DESC fields?
2. EDIT_DATE for tabular information is going to very difficult since there are many tables in a tax system. Would it be acceptable to provide the last time the spatial data was updated?
3. Is it expected that there will be a standard coordinate system that is going to be preferred with the data delivery?

And of course, the biggest questions that came up are who's expected to pay for the modifications that will be needed to make adjustments in the tax download processes to fulfill the standard requirements, and will there be any state money supplied to assist towards this?

MARK SLOAN, CLAY COUNTY: RECEIVED JAN 20, 2017

We are looking forward to being able to utilize this standard to better share our parcel data with agencies and organizations throughout Minnesota. We feel the standard is fair and appropriate, and support its adoption.

RANDY KNIPPEL, DAKOTA COUNTY: RECEIVED JAN 20, 2017

Dakota County has no issues with the proposed standard. We further recommend that, once it is adopted, we change our MetroGIS standard to this and only provide parcel data in this format.

GEORGE MEYER, OTTER TAIL COUNTY: RECEIVED JAN 19, 2017
(Comments collected by George during his discussions and communications with other county GIS staff from around Minnesota)

Recommendations to change field names or widths (sizes):

Field name LEGAL_DESC, suggestion to be changed to "TAX_DESC" for purposes of caution using the word "legal";

EDIT_DATE, suggestion to date of parcel edits be left in metadata, perhaps change to PUB_DATE (publication date) or similar;

PLAT_NAME – some counties with more than 50 chars;

LOT [is currently set at] 5 characters. Recommend this be changed to 8 characters in length
There may be a field length change in the next version to accommodate the need for more text.

Change PIN to STATE_PIN for clarification of statewide ID (post aggregation)
There is a current request to change these field names to CNTY_PIN and STATE_PIN or something like that for more clarification. Currently PIN is the parcel ID that's calculated by adding the unique county ID to the ORG_PIN

Change ORG_PIN to PIN for clarification of original county PIN
(ORG_PIN *is the parcel ID number as it is in your county*)

UNIT_INFO – request for how to handle multi-unit parcels, like apartments
Perhaps either use a primary unit, or a "multiple" be allowed as a value

UNIT_INFO would be the unit number if applicable for a parcel, we're currently discussing what to do with multiple units.   Perhaps a primary unit number, or multiple. You're not alone in this—many cities/counties have unique PINS for each unit in a condo; these parcels are stacked on each other, other agencies like my county use only one parcel for a whole building. We're working on a best fit scenario.

Comments on aggregation and scripting:

Several comments agreeing to the point of counties submit their data in the standard, once final form approved. MNDNR is working on a Python script to assist counties once the 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; goes in part with trimmed/slimmed dataset.

With regards to a script. A Python script to assist counties in putting their data into the proposed standard is being developed and tested, and it will be shared with everyone once we get it finalized. I believe we'll be putting it out either on the standards webpage, or in the geospatial commons.

Other comments:

Trimmed attribute version/slimmed set requested by several respondents;

[Recommend creation of a] WMS service – cache;

Comments collected specifically from Sherburne County:

Sherburne Co – some plats contain lot and block numbers as plat name and legal desc; Concern that there isn't a way to show info. – *perhaps something in comments section?*

Sherburne Co – street type limitations due to unique street names with no postal abbreviation. *ALC perhaps – no ALC exists in postal standard, so no conflict;*

ERIC WILLETTE, MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, PROPERTY TAX DIVISION: RECEIVED JAN 19, 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to respond with to the proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard. We would like to contribute the following comments for consideration as this proposal moves forward. We would like to express our particular concern that while the Department of Revenue was included in some initial discussions, we were ultimately not included in the stakeholder group. Property tax-related data are the most prevalent within the proposed standards, despite the fact that we were not involved in setting them.

Interactions with the Property Records Information System of Minnesota (PRISM) and other parcel data sources.

As you are aware, the department is in the process of converting our abstract data submissions into parcel-level data submissions. This has been a time of intensive programming both within our agency and for our external county partners. We understand that the proposed standards do not apply to counties, but will apply to us. As of this writing, we are not in a position to ask or require that our county partners undertake any additional work to gather new property tax data or information, or to transmit it in any new way. We will not be requesting new data that we are not already requesting from our county partners, nor will we be changing how we receive information from current and predetermined formats. We have been working diligently on meeting our own internal needs for data sets and information as well, and have been programming how we will be able to present that information to our various customers. We are not in a position to commit additional resources to gathering or sharing new data sets or information, or existing data in a new way. As resources allow we can, over time, work toward migrating our products to conform with the proposed standards.

Potential for unforeseen costs

We have concerns that the department's property tax and parcel information may be more heavily relied-upon than other agencies' data, due to the amounts of parcel-specific data that we can gather. This has led to concerns about the potential cost of implementing the proposed data standards, if requests for our data and information increase and are expected to meet new formats. Additionally, because counties are not beholden to these standards, we want to note there may be issues raised by counties if they lose established customer relationships to the Department of Revenue if those customers seek out the department's information instead of the counties'.

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.

Contact me with questions

Please contact me if you have questions about any of our comments regarding the proposed Parcel Data Transfer Standard at eric.willette@state.mn.us.

DAVID BRANDT, WASHINGTON COUNTY: RECEIVED JAN18, 2017

Washington County approves of the Statewide Parcel Data Transfer Standard (Version 2). Understanding this standard is not final, we are testing the new schema with our recent move to a cloud-hosted tax system. I see no mention of data format for sharing. We would prefer to share the data in Esri Geodatabase format and not shapefile format.

David Brandt
Geospatial Systems Architect
Washington County, MN
651.430.6451

CHELSEY BAGENT, SWIFT COUNTY: RECEIVED JAN 17, 2017

I have reviewed the proposed parcel standard and have a few comments/questions for you.

#1 I think it would be better at the county level if instead of how the fields PIN & ORIG_PIN are set as, it would be set as something similar to this:

STATE_**PIN**	text	25	Unique Parcel ID	Unique statewide parcel ID comprised of the county PIN with the COUNTY_ID followed by a dash appended to the front.
PIN	text	25	County's Parcel ID	The county's unaltered parcel ID used to reference county information and documents

#2 Are there any specifications about Alias field names? Is it acceptable to have them match what is in the tax system instead of this standard?
We are currently completing our parcel layer and I am trying to determine the best way to have the field structure and workflows for all departments and systems involved.

Thanks,
Chelsey Bagent
GIS Specialist
Swift County

Courthouse | Land Records Office
301 14th Street N | PO Box 207 | Benson, MN 56215
Office: 320-314-8366 | Fax: 320-843-6105
chelsey.bagent@co.swift.mn.us | http://www.swiftcounty.com
Facebook: www.facebook.com/SwiftCountyMN

MICHELLE TRAGER, RICE COUNTY – RECEIVED JAN 9, 2017

For the PIN field, since it's appending COUNTY_ID to the county PIN shouldn't the field length be longer? (Is the county PIN the ORIG_PIN?);

Can there be more than one value in the UNIT_INFO field? Some of our parcels have more than one unit on them;

We have some lots that are out lots, so we have entries like "OUTLOT A" and would need 8 characters. Are others abbreviating out lot?;

Since it's going to be a transfer standard, will there be a script that is used to convert the data into the standard? If so, can the script be shared?;

Michelle Trager, MS, GISP
Rice County GIS Coordinator
320 3rd St NW, Faribault MN 55021
507-332-5950

MIKE DOLBOW, MNGEO: RECEIVED DEC 21, 2017

I'm very excited to see the parcel data transfer standard go through another review. Overall I think it is very solid and meets the goal of representing a wide range of interests. If we ever truly have 87 counties' worth of data in this format, with even 50% of the columns populated, it will indeed be a tremendous resource.

My only concern with the standard is the sheer volume of it. There are 78 (!) columns in the new standard. I always thought of the Metro standard as "nice to have, but generally too much", especially when it comes to potential performance. For the record, I'm *not* suggesting that the standard be changed, but for performance reasons, it might be nice to see a subset of columns be defined as the "slim standard", which is acceptable to transfer data in if performance suffers under the full suite of columns. (I'm aware that not all columns need to be populated to meet the standard – but even if 60 of the columns are empty, such a feature class could still get quite slow.)

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.

Again, I don't think this should alter the standard, but I do think it merits consideration either in future standards or in potential implementations of this standard. Otherwise I fear we might be "biting off more than we can chew".

Mike Dolbow
GIS Supervisor | Geospatial Information Office
Minnesota IT Services | Partners in Performance
625 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN 55155
O: 651-201-3944
mike.dolbow@state.mn.us

VIC BARNETT, RAMSEY COUNTY: RECEIVED DEC 7, 2016

Building Number is something not applicable to parcel data. Working with our Assessor, I have learned the correct term is **Situs Address**, this refers to the legally designated address of the parcel, and may or may not be related to the actual addresses posted on buildings within the parcel. For example, a PIN may have a Situs Address of "5 University Ave W". Buildings on that parcel may have number like 3 University Ave W and or 7 University Ave W. Hope this is useful. That being said, about 99% of the time the Situs Address Number matches the Building Address Number.

Vic Barnett | Management Analyst & GIS
Ramsey County Emergency Communications
(651) 266-7737
vic.barnett@co.ramsey.mn.us

SHAWN GERTKEN, WABASHA COUNTY: RECEIVED NOV 4, 2016

There's one modification I'd like to have made: MSAG Community Domain – There is an option for WABASHA COUNTY SO, but per the MSAG, any rural address has a MSAG Community Name of "WABASHA COUNTY"
Shawn R. Gertken, Wabasha County GIS Coordinator
625 Jefferson Ave, Wabasha, MN 55981, 651-565-5164

EMAIL CONVERSATION: NOVEMBER 3: NOV 4, 2016

Bart Richardson (MNDNR): The big picture question is, how should the parcel standard be implemented? Should the data creator or the data user do the conversion? Since the counties understand their data better than anyone else, ideally they should handle the conversion into the standard – just like the metro counties do for MetroGIS. The Parcel Committee is advocating that counties use the parcel standard for data sharing, such as posting to the Commons. Just imagine all parcel data delivered to the Commons in the same format! Yup, a crazy dream, but worth striving for.

Mark Sloan (Clay County): I'll support what Bart is saying, the whole purpose of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard is so that all parcels are shared in the same format. It has always been proposed that the data producer's role would be to convert their data to the transfer standard and then share it with everyone.

Ryan Stovern (St. Louis County): I agree. We at St. Louis County are going to be building an entire new data set to meet the standard. We had our first meeting on it internally yesterday. The goal is for it to replace our current parcel dataset we us at the county. It will take some work to get it built but once it is built and all the scripts and views are created it will just run on a nightly basis for us and we will forget about it and it will just run.

Curt Carlson (NorthStar MLS): By the same token, no one is proposing that the counties be held to only posting their data to the commons in the Standard Data format, correct? I would surmise that the best position would be for us to *encourage* the counties to share in the standard format on the commons and still be free to share their data *in addition* in their native format or a format of their choice. Reading the standard, it would appear that only State Agencies are compelled to abide by the standard. As I read it, counties are free to do what they want:

The Question of Compliance: What constitutes compliance?
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 the purpose of 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.

Mike Dolbow (MnGeo): Curt hit the nail on the head. We definitely want to encourage counties to use the standard, but we can't compel them to do that. My understanding of Dakota and Ramsey's contributions (to the MetroGIS Parcel Standard) was that they had some additional fields that added value, which I think is a good thing (and it makes those contributions less duplicative of the regional

aggregation). So, we'll encourage them to use the standard (especially if they ask what format it should be in), or as compromises, a subset of the standard (same column specs and contents, just less columns) or the standard plus additions. But in the worst case, we'll take whatever we can get – even the geometry with *no* columns has a use, and is better than nothing. One of our responsibilities at the state, as I see it, is as we develop processes and code to convert "native" formats into standard formats, is to share those processes and code with the counties, so eventually they are doing what Ryan described. It's going to be a long haul, but we'll get there.

BRETT FORBES, STEARNS COUNTY: RECEIVED NOV 1, 2016

Our GIS staff here at Sherburne County have reviewed the draft standard and have a few issues that we would see with it as it currently is presented. The PLAT_NAME field is specified at 50 characters. We have 225 plats with names longer than 50 characters the longest is 113 characters. This field would be too short for us to populate it with valid names.

We have a few plats where there are lots blocks and units that make up the valid legal description with this standard there is not a way to show that information. Below are links to the scanned plat files that have this as part of the legal descriptions. This unit number wouldn't be part of the physical address for the site and as such we did not feel that it should go there.

http://www.co.sherburne.mn.us/publicworks/survey/platimages/BBPLTP29.pdf
http://www.co.sherburne.mn.us/publicworks/survey/plat_detail.asp?platid=1534

The last thing we noted was that the STREETTYPE field was set to only 4 characters. Sherburne County has some city streets that have types that don't have a valid postal abbreviation, such as "Kingsbarn Alcove". The USPS doesn't list an abbreviation for this street type.

Brett Forbes - GIS Coordinator
Sherburne County Public Works
13880 Business Center Drive
Elk River, MN 55330
ph: (763)765-3311 fax: (763)765-3301

MARK VOLZ, LYON COUNTY: RECEIVED OCT 31, 2016

What format would you like us to use for dates in the parcel transfer standard?
Examples:
- 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;
- Or something different;

Please let me know if there are any expected formats;

KEYLOR ANDREWS, MN GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: RECEIVED OCT 25, 2016

The county codes on this web page are different than typical alphabetical numbering scheme, yet there is no explanation of why they are different?

https://mn.gov/mnit/programs/policies/geospatial/gis-pages/mn-county-identification-codes.jsp

Keylor Andrews, Hydrologist
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Ecological and Water Resources
Hydrogeology and Groundwater Unit
keylor.andrews@state.mn.us
Office: 651-259-5702

Response from Nancy Rader:
Thanks for checking with us. As I expect you know, different coding systems develop over time as different people create datasets independently and for different purposes; at some point, the diversity of coding systems used can cause enough headaches when sharing data that it's worth the effort to agree on a standard. In the case of county codes, two main systems were used in Minnesota for years: a 2-digit code of 1-87 assigned to the counties in alphabetic order (I think this is the code you're referring to?) and the 3-digit code described on the webpage you found. After a long period of debate and public review, state agencies agreed to establish the 3-digit code as the state standard since it follows the international and national codes set by INCITS and ANSI (as described in the first paragraph on the webpage). The only time that a state agency must use the 3-digit standard is when transferring data to an external customer, except if the agency and the customer have agreed to use a different coding system. An agency can use other systems internally, or can provide data with attributes for both the 2-digit and 3-digit systems. At the time the standard was established, it was unreasonable to expect every agency to go back and translate all legacy datasets that used the 2-digit system into the 3-digit system. When developing new datasets, however, it's advisable to use the 3-digit standard so that in time, all of our agency datasets are consistent.

For more information on geospatial standards in Minnesota, see the Standards Committee webpage: http://www.mngeo.state.mn.us/committee/standards/ Note that a standard for parcel attributes is currently open for review – if it is of interest to you, please feel free to comment! Does that help? Please let me know if you have further questions,

JARED HOVI, CARLTON COUNTY: RECEIVED OCT 21, 2016

LEGAL_DESC – I've had several discussions with our Recorder and Auditor about the term "Legal Description", which has lead us to using "Tax Description" in our online mapping applications. I believe most tax systems are setup with such a field so it's easy to move over, but would be cautious of the word "Legal" for people can interpret that as what's on the deed. Granted the Comments sections notes "Abbreviated", but I'd like to see that in the Description field as well and recommend further discussion about the field name.

EDIT_DATE: "The date on which the spatial or tabular data for an *individual* parcel polygon was last updated or edited."   I see several things about this that could be assumed or overwritten.
If there is a *need* to know when a spatial update was made to an *individual* parcel, that needs to be a separate field. How people would populate that, I don't know.

For instance, Fabric tracks editing updates, but when it's moved to Published whoever is the author of the script overwrites the editor tracking fields for all parcels. Would it be better to have spatial updates noted in the metadata instead? "Spatial data last updated MM/DD/YYYY". In my 8 years of county work, I've never experienced a staff person or company asking about an individual parcel being updated, just the set.

Regarding tabular data, again it should be a separate field and I agree on this being needed. However, is it noting tabular data that has been updated in the GIS parcel layer or the tabular data as joined to the parcel layer? If it's the table as joined to the parcel layer, are you talking about the date that it was pulled from the tax system or when that *individual* parcel was updated in the tax system. I'm assuming the date in which the data was pulled from the tax system. Some clarification may be needed on this. If just the EDIT_DATE field exists, the tabular date is most likely going to overwrite the spatial update regularly. I'd recommend looking at two different fields and revise the Comments field, removing the word *individual* may help.

PHILIPP NAGEL, CITY OF WASECA: RECEIVED OCT 12, 2016

My comments regarding the parcel data transfer standard are as follows:

PIN / ORIG_PIN;

PIN consists of COUNTY_ID (3 chars) + "-" (1 char) + ORIG-PIN (25 chars) therefore its length should be 3+1+25 = 29, but is indicated as 25;

If entry in ORIG_PIN is 25, it would be impossible to populate PIN

Suggestions:
Either change length of PIN to 29 or remove field PIN completely as it contains redundant information anyway. Its value can be derived from COUNTY_ID and the delimiter (-)

In Comment section:
Consider rewording to be more clear and use standard field names to avoid confusion:
"Unique statewide parcel ID comprised of the fields COUNTY_ID and ORIG_PIN, delimited by a dash"

Legal Description related fields – field order
PLAT_NAME, BLOCK, LOT, ACRES_POLY, ACRES_DEED, SECTION, TOWNSHIP, RANGE, RANG_DIR, LEGAL_DESC, should all these fields be "next to each other" since they are all related?

Philipp Nagel, GIS Coordinator, City of Waseca
508 S. State Street
Waseca, MN 56093
PhilippN@ci.waseca.mn.us
P. 507-835-9733

MARK VOLZ, LYON COUNTY: RECEIVED OCT 7, 2016

In addition to my previous comments concerning schemas concerns (attribute lengths, field size >254 characters for shapefiles), I would like to also submit the following comments:

Field Order
I imagine that we would like to reorder all of the fields in a way that makes sense to our county. When we submit data to the state will it matter if the fields are out of order from your schema. I don't think it should, but I would like to verify this.

Single line Property Address
Unfortunately, our property address is in a single line. Will it be okay if the house number is on the same line of the street name?

One to Many Relationship – Property Address
Will the state allow more than 1 property address per parcel? Our current system supports up to 3 property addresses for a single parcel – and in some cases 3 is not enough!

Farm Data
Would it be beneficial to have Tillable Acres, and Tillable Value?

Total Tax
Are you looking for the total taxable value of the property (which may be different than EMV), or are you looking for the amount that the property will be taxed? EG if George has a house that is worth $150,000 and since he is not exempt he will pay $1,500 in taxes than do you want total tax = $150,000 or $1,500?

Legal Description and fields
Please consider grouping together the following fields:

PLAT_NAME
BLOCK
LOT
SECTION
TOWNSHIP
RANGE
RANG_DIR
LEGAL_DESC

I might even consider ordering the attributes from geographically smallest to largest such as Lot, Block, Plat, Section, Township, Range

Group Use Descriptions, move up owner and taxpayer information
I would consider moving ACRES_POLY and ACRES_DEED down by the assessment data.
USE1_DESC to 4 and MULTI_USES should be moved down to be near the Exempt Uses.
I might consider promoting the tax payer and owner information up?

MARK VOLZ, LYON COUNTY: RECEIVED OCT 4, 2016

I have several questions and comments considering the new Draft Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

Applicability

The 3rd and 4th statement confused me at first. Does this mean that if possible that the county MUST provide parcel data in this format to the state? It just seemed confusing because the 3rd statement implies that the standard is almost mandatory, while the 4th implies that it is voluntary.

Parcel ID

Please consider moving the County Parcel ID **ORIG_PIN** directly under the State **PIN.**

Differences between the Parcel Data Transfer Standard and the proposed NG9-1-1 Address Point Standard

I noticed some differences between the Parcel Data Transfer Standard and the proposed NG9-1-1 Address Point Standard. I don't know if either standard needs to be modified so this is just for your information. **All I care about is that if I will be able to run QAQC between address on my parcel dataset to that of the NG9-1-1 dataset.** Note, in addition I am aware that we can use our own standard, however one of the counties that I work with will consider adopting this standard as the only one they use and therefore it will be important that these datasets are comparable!

County ID

The current NG9-1-1 address point data has county spelled out. Example: WABASHA

PIN

NG911 has this set as 17 Characters

BLDG_NUM

NG911 breaks down the building number differently

New NG911 Street Name Fields

The street name and related prefix and suffix fields are different between the Parcel standard and NG9-1-1.

UNIT_INFO

The Address Number Suffix is 15 Characters in NG911.

CITY (Actual)

The length for Municipality in NG911 is 100 characters.

CITY (Postal)

The length for the Postal Community Name in NG911 is 40 characters.

LANDMARK

NG911 uses 150 characters for LANDMARK

Other Schema concerns:

Date Format
What date formats are expected or allowed?

LEGAL_DESC
Consider decreasing to the length to 255 characters so it is compliant with DBF4. In addition, for some reason I remember having to use 254 Characters within ESRI's products.

ORIG_PIN
The County PIN should be 4 characters less than the state PIN.

EXPORT_DATE, MARKET_YEAR, possibly others.
The length of a field is limited to 10 characters in shapefiles.

MITCHELL SCHAPS, MN.IT SERVICES: RECEIVED OCT 6, 2016
Standard for what features should be considered as valid to be included in a parcel data set that is standardized/aggregated by MNGEO;

I am the student worker at MNGEO that has been in charge of much of the standardization process of parcel feature class fields to the Draft Parcel Data Transfer Standard. Because of this, I have had a lot of exposure to the parcel data, and what has been going in to manipulating parcel data so that it can conform to the standard. From my experiences manipulating the data the main recommended change to the standard that I would propose is setting an actual standard for what data in parcel feature classes should be considered. Currently, from my examining 84 out of the 87 County's parcel data, I have a pretty good idea of what features Counties have decided to include in their parcel feature classes. What I have seen personally are:

1 - Lakes, Rivers, and other bodies of water
2 - Road polygons
3 - Deeded or other varieties of rows
4 - State land with non-unique PIN

Having all of these distinct features possibly show up in a county layer has caused problems with various fields, but especially the PIN field because that is supposed to be the field that is used to identify parcels. Certain applications that have been designed around using parcel data, like the BWSR BuffCat application run into issues when every single parcel cannot be uniquely identified. Many of these features that are included that are not parcels are not given unique identification. They are often all given either the same code, or they ended up beginning with the same "prefix code", and are uniquely identified from there. Having all of these different features as possible inclusions to the feature class also creates a problem of identity for the parcel feature class. Can the feature class actually be called a "Parcel feature class" if it could possibly contain road features, water, deeded rows, and etc?.

In my personal view, the Parcel feature classes should be restricted to just Tax parcels that can be uniquely identified, and should be stripped of features like water. Deeded rows, road polygons, and etc. However, I am not saying that these polygons should not be put out there as an option for people to download. What I do think is that these features, especially deeded rows, should be separated out into their own district feature class with its own standards. This procedure could also be followed for the road polygons, and parcels with non-unique identifiers. All of these separate features could then be included in a geodatabase, so if somebody wants to use deeded rows in some form of analysis, they can, and if someone else wants to do an analysis with only confirmed PIN tax parcels, they can as well. Water features can be found in many other legitimate sources, and I do not think that they need to be included with the parcel feature classes

CURT PETERSON, RAMSEY COUNTY: RECEIVED OCT 4, 2016

I have only one comment or suggestion. The last field name listed in the table of proposed parcel attributes is "ORIG_PIN". That caught my eye and I thought it may be the Original PIN or PID that this parcel may have been derived from. IE: the parent historical parcel ID. When I looked the table description or comments it explains that it is the unaltered parcel ID for use with county documents or taxation information.   In that case could we simply name this field "COUNTY_PIN"? That way we can easily know it is the unaltered county PIN or PID. Thanks for all your efforts. I think the new proposed parcel transfer standard looks good!

Curtis Peterson, GIS Supervisor
Ramsey County, Department of Public Works
1425 Paul Kirkwold Drive
Arden Hills, MN 55112-3933
Phone: 651-266-7172
www.ramseycounty.us

JOHN NERGE, CITY OF BROOKLYN PARK: OCT 4, 2016

I didn't see anything concerning in the standard as far as how our organization uses parcel data.

MIKE DOLBOW, MNGEO: RECEIVED SEP 7, 2016

We came upon this issue when trying to aggregate parcels from counties around the state. To be clear, this isn't about the split, discrete address columns like "BLDG_NUM" and "STREETNAME", it's about the more generic address columns where counties try to shove everything but the kitchen sink:

OWNER_NAME
OWNER_MORE
OWN_ADD_L1
OWN_ADD_L2
OWN_ADD_L3
TAX_NAME
TAX_ADD_L1
TAX_ADD_L2
TAX_ADD_L3

In about 2% of records statewide, Mitch has found strings longer than the 40-50 chars set aside for those fields. For example, this in Own_Add_L1: 500 LAFAYETTE RD BOX 45 BUREAU OF RE MANAGEMENT Mitch did some counts, and the field with the most rows over a length of 40 characters was Tax_Name with 58,116 of them. Second to that was **Owner_Name** with 10,486. This is out of 3 million records, so hence the 2% number is bloated by itself (based on the higher 58K record).

Bottom line: I don't think this is worth changing the standard over. We'll just truncate the contents of those fields to meet the spec. Let's face it, these columns are to facilitate mailing, and if the USPS gets an accurate house number and zip code, they'll get it there. But I thought you guys should know and that we should warn data producers and users.

(Note: This was addressed by making the field widths 100 characters in version 2.0 of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard)