

# Statewide Parcel Data Meeting

Wednesday, February 28, 2007

9:00 AM to 11:00 AM

Office of the Interagency Committee

1111 Washington St. SE, Olympia WA 98501

Room 259

## Meeting Minutes

**Attendees:** Sam Bardelson, USGS; Luke Rogers, UW; Paul Andrews, Kitsap Co; Tim Keck, BLM; Orrin Frederick, BLM; Scott Kellogg, DOH; Marc Thomas, FGDC; Ken Reister, DNR; Marc McCalmen, WDFW; Rich Kim; ECY; Whitney Buschmann, WSDOT; Jordyn Mitchell, WSDOT; Jane Ely, DOR; David Gadsden, ESRI; Mike Mohrman, OFM; Craig Erickson, DOH; Doretta Collins, DNR; Deborah Naslund, DNR; Joy Paulus, IAC; David Jennings, DOH; Greg Tudor; DNR; Tom Williams, DSHS

### AGENDA ITEM

**Next Meeting:** April 18, 2007 NRB Room 259

#### *Introductions and Announcements:*

#### **Parcels Data for Fire Protection (BLM/ FGDC)**

Need to acquire parcel data from counties in thirteen western states

Federal government is spending a lot of money fighting fires

They need to fight fires smarter, with cooperation from cities and counties

Trying to put out fires at wild land / urban interface – parcels would help locate these junctures

Attributes – Building clusters, parcel number, land value, structure value, owner name

Parcel geometry is also needed

Regardless of whether parcels framework goes forward they will have to do this – they can offer some legwork but need backing

They have no money to purchase data – they will ask counties to give it to them

In the long run there may be money for this effort

Ken (DNR)

The resource protection division at DNR has people interested in this type of information

Luke (UW)

Luke is using money from the forest service to do his work over the next year

The timing of his work might not work for the fire effort

A large part of the problem is the agreements with the counties – if Luke wants to share the data he has to go back to the county to obtain a new data agreement

Sharing agreements have been difficult to establish in the past

Luke has data from all 39 counties in one form or another

Counties have to pay for data from state so they are reluctant to give their data away for free

State agencies need to consider what work they are doing that would be of use to the counties

***Overview of the Parcel Survey Results:***

**Survey Results** (Luke - UW)

Intent of survey - to qualify and understand needs of parcel data, build business case, determine costs, build interest in project

Feedback received from state, federal, private and county users

43 responded – 12 state; 5 federal, 8 local, 8 private (some responses represented multiple users)

Majority need parcels for entire state

Most were interested in land ownership, research and monitoring, boundary changes and annexations

Feature geometry was important - mapping, geocoding, generating mailing list, etc

Attributes - parcel number most important, owner name, land use, zoning, address, etc.

21 said that a law mandates maintaining the information they derive from parcels

Most are getting parcel data from county ftp site - many agencies had about a dozen county parcel data sets

State agencies have low percentage license agreements, private entities have high percentage

Federal agencies have almost no license agreements

Few entities have data sharing agreements

Variety of formats: shapefiles, coverage, geodatabases, some SDE, some AutoCad

Inconvenience of collecting data causes people to use outdated data

Sharing of data within organization - sharing off network file system, ArcSDE, ArcIMS

Many organizations are producing derivative products, many of which are publicly available

If they are not available it is often because metadata is not complete, there is a lack of interest from counties, legal issues and liability, lack of mechanism to share or no staff available to maintain or answer questions

Update frequency - Quarterly and annual updates are desired; cities and counties might need weekly

Some had concerns that state wide dataset would be large

Joy (IAC) Expressed concern about mailing lists with owner name information

Washington law states that list of names can't be used for commercial purposes but there is no enforcement or penalty for violating it

***Next Logical Step?***

- Compilation of a survey for counties to address their needs, limitations, and requirements.

Need to build a business case for access to the data and need to build interest in this project.

**Timeline** (David - DOH)

DOH wants to contact counties soon

Suggested a centralized place to come together and create data sharing license agreements that are centrally maintained

There is a need to become more efficient in the next twelve to eighteen months

The Federal Government and Department of Ecology also need to have this information in the near future

## **Funding**

One option would be a recording fee - similar to what Oregon did with OR map  
Every parcel that is recorded has a transaction tax  
This model has had the highest level of success but would be a legislative approach  
Clark County has looked into this  
Title companies and realty companies could lobby for this  
Thus far the legislature does not seem to support GIS efforts  
This is a long-term solution

Need to consider what some short-term solutions would be.

## **Infrastructure**

Need to be aware of the technology that is available right now (ex: NAIP imagery for Washington will be about 4 terabytes)  
UW is an option in terms of providing enough bandwidth  
UW also has archival capabilities

## **Frequency of Updates (Tom - OFM)**

Frequency of update is important to OFM  
If the parcels are updated at the wrong time (i.e. not in accordance with their quarters) the information is not useful to them

## **Informing Counties**

The parcel framework could be incorporated into NW Users Group conference or WAURISA – this may be a good way to inform the counties about the project  
The importance of engaging a dialog with the counties was stressed throughout the meeting

Ian (Spokane County)

It is a big fiscal commitment on the county's part to establish a GIS infrastructure  
Many counties still have data on mylars, etc – the GIS may not be current due to the time and cost to put the data into GIS. Parcel data changes on a daily basis.  
It might be helpful to learn more about the internal dynamic of a county – in Ian's experience the assessor that made the initial investment [in a GIS effort] is often reluctant to share the resulting data

## ***Parcel Framework Project?***

- Is there an organization or agency willing to take a leadership role in moving this from an ad-hoc discussion to a Framework Management Project
- Interest, commitment and workload that's inherent in the project of this magnitude.

## **Action Items**

David (DOH)

DOH is willing to put forth some resources. David will help head up the effort for now.

Luke (UW)

Luke has working relationships with the counties. Luke will draft a survey that can be sent to the counties for their feedback. Several meeting attendees volunteered to review the survey.

Summarize survey results into brief document  
Create survey for counties  
Draft possible data standard  
Draft catch all pass through license agreement

Rich (ECY)

ECY will be doing an annual update of county parcels soon for their needs

Joy (IAC)

Draft a charter and send to David

Other Stakeholders

The group as a whole needs to articulate a vision and determine what its needs are. Draft a list of the following for your agency:

Business needs

What the organization can offer the counties in return for their parcel data

What the organization produces based on the county parcels

**Parcel Framework Project Managers:** Co-leads – David Jennings, Dept. of Health and Luke Rogers, Univ. of Washington

### **Additional Information**

A special thanks to Whitney K. Buschmann, GIS Analyst with WSDOT for the excellent meeting notes.