MnGeo Standards Committee Meeting Notes - Draft

Thursday, June 7, 2012
1:30 – 3:30 PM
304 Centennial Office Building
658 Cedar Street; St. Paul, MN 55155

Attendees:

Committee Members

Chris Cialek	MnGeo
Mark Kotz (Chair)	Metropolitan Council
Nancy Rader	MnGeo

Guests

Curt Carlson	NorthstarMLS; DCDC Representative
Bart Richardson	MN Department of Natural Resources; DCDC Representative
Jeff Storlie	St. Louis County Planning & Development Department; DCDC Representative

Meeting called to order at 1:30 PM

Agenda: Agenda approved

Items Requiring Action or Discussion:

The primary purpose of this meeting is to receive, review and assess a new standard developed by the Digital Cadastral Data Committee titled: Digital Cadastral Data Attribute Transfer Standard.

a) MN State Government Standards Approval Process.

Cialek and Kotz started by described the standards ratification process used by this committee:

1. A proposed standard is developed by a group of subject matter experts.
2. The standard is organized in a format prescribed by the Standards Committee.
3. The proposed standard is brought to this Standards Committee by a Standard's Steering Group for introduction, clarification.
4. Once passed through the Standards Committee, the proposed standard goes out for public review.
5. Comments and concerns are collected during the public review and addressed by the Standards Committee and representatives of the originating subject matter experts.
6. In cases where the Public Review process results in significant changes, the standard may be released for a second round of Public Review.

7. After review and final change the Standards Committee votes to recommend it go to the two MnGeo Advisory Councils for approval votes.
8. Once the standard is approved by both those bodies, it is considered a provisional state geospatial standard.
9. The provisional standard may be further advanced through the Minnesota Office of Enterprise Technology (now MN.IT) formal standards acceptance process. A decision to move forward will be made by the Standards Committee in consultation with the Standard's Steering Group.

b) Steering Group Presentation of the Proposed Cadastral Data Transfer Standard.

The Steering Group presented the Cadastral Data Transfer Standard document and Carlson provided an overview of its development.

A number of years ago the former Land Records Modernization Committee (now the Digital Cadastral Data Committee) identified a desire for counties and their partners to agree on a transfer mechanism for parcel attribute information in order to more effectively share data that each county collects and maintains individually. Since 10% of Minnesota counties producing cadastral GIS at the time had already voluntarily adopted a data transfer standard developed by Metropolitan Twin Cities counties through MetroGIS that had been folded into a comprehensive parcel data sharing plan by MetroGIS and its partners, it was determined that this list of 65 attributes represented a suitable common standard. With minor changes to include attributes of particular importance to more rural counties, the Cadastral Data Transfer Standard presented here establishes common attribute definitions and field types for 71 attributes considered the most critical when sharing this type of data.

At this point a detailed review of the proposed standard as presented was conducted by the meeting members beginning with the table of field names and their details. Important comments and decisions are listed here:

- For the public review, prepare an FAQ list to help explain to reviewers details not covered in the formal standard text.

- The only absolutely mandatory fields are the first two: County ID and Parcel Identification Number.

- What policy will be developed to deal with the issue of null vs. blank fields?

- Change "Field Size" to "Field Length".

- Check to determine if County_ID is based on FIPS or ANSI standard (has FIPS been retired?). **ACTION: Cialek**

- Determine whether the PIN punctuation should be called a "dash" or a "hyphen". **ACTION: Carlson**

- Rewrite sentence immediately above field table so that it includes explicit directive of what is required to comply with this standard. **ACTION: Kotz**

- Accept all edits provided by Kotz and Rader in version of standard being reviewed except Comment MJK19 (do not move Section, Township and Range fields at this time).

- No proper field name should contain a blank character. The submitted draft standard does contain underscores, but due to table formatting, they appear as blank spaces. Adjust formatting to fix this.

- CITY_USPS: consider expanding field description to clarify the potential difference between the formal city in which a property is located and that address's postal city. **ACTION: Carlson**

- SCHOOL_DST: in field description, include hyperlink to list of Minnesota school districts, their formal numbers and names. **ACTION: Rader**

- PARC_CODE: in Field description, add details on how to fill out this field and include domain list. Add the domain list to the geodatabase template. **ACTION: Richardson/Kotz**

- Comment NKR20: contact Renee Johnson (DNR) to determine if Range east or west designation is critical to add. If so, ask her perspective on how to best represent that directionality. If DNR recommends adding a Range direction field, do so without convening another meeting. **ACTION: Rader**

- Under "Purpose of this Standard", last sentence: Change "any field may be left ~~blank~~ **unpopulated** except…"

- Under "Standard Requirements and Data Definition", paragraph 1, first sentence: Change "specifications with ~~the addition of~~ six additional…"

- Under "Standard Requirements and Data Definition", paragraph 2, second sentence: Delete entire sentence "~~Even one text field with one extra character can cripple a statewide data load.~~"

- Under "Standard Requirements and Data Definition", paragraph 2, third sentence: Change "…retained but left ~~blank~~ **unpopulated**."

- Ask reviewers for their opinions for questions about suitable level of detail: should FIELD TYPE be defined more explicitly? Example: is "numeric" a good enough description, or should we call for short or long integer, single-, double- precision, floating point?

- Put revised geodatabase template on MnGeo web site. **ACTION: Richardson and Rader**

- From the field description text, remove the specific references to counties used in the MetroGIS specifications and replace them with more generic language when appropriate. For example: under OWNER_NAME field description, "Inclusion of multiple owners is ~~up to each county~~ **optional**." **ACTION: Kotz**

c) Is it Ready for Public Review?

MOTION: Approve for Public Review the proposed Digital Cadastral Attribute Transfer Standard, after changes described above are completed and reviewed by the Standards Committee and the Standard's Steering Group. [Rader]

SECONDED: Cialek

APPROVED: unanimously

d) Public Review Process

At such point that the conditions described in the motion are satisfied, the Standards Committee will take charge of the next step in the process by commencing the Public Review process and will promote review of the standard within the Minnesota geospatial community. The Standard's Steering Group (DCDC Committee) will be responsible for promoting review of the standard within other important stakeholder communities.

Review Action Items: Please see action item assignments identified in bulleted list above.

Adjourn: Meeting Adjourned 3:30 PM; Time and place of next meeting not discussed.

Meeting notes prepared by:
C. Cialek
June 8, 2012