

Statewide Parcel Data Meeting

Wednesday, April 18, 2007

9:00 AM to 11:00 AM

Office of the Interagency Committee

1111 Washington St. SE, Olympia WA 98501

Room 259

Meeting Minutes

The meeting was chaired by David Jennings (DOH). Co-chair Luke Rogers was unable to attend as he was out of town at a conference.

AGENDA ITEM

Next Meeting: May 23, 2007 9:00 am – 11:00 am DOH Tumwater

Introductions and Announcements

Timeline

UW (Luke Rogers), under a contract with DNR and DOH, expects to pull together a statewide parcel layer by Fall 2007

Funding for the development of this [interim] product has been secured

There is some pressure on the timeline due to a need for federal agencies to have this information for the wildland fire season - the FGDC is preparing to ask the counties for attributes for their parcels

FGDC should coordinate with Luke as they both need to contact counties for parcel data

Over the next 18 months Luke's UW team will work to identify and develop a process by which to create a statewide parcel layer

Estimated Cost

Please note that these figures are guesstimates

\$200,000 (one time) - initial development of periodically refreshed statewide parcel layer

\$50,000 (annually) - ongoing annual maintenance of periodically refreshed statewide parcel layer (servers, code edits, etc.)

Product

The initial product that Luke is currently working on will not be completely integrated, i.e. the counties will not be tied together with a stand-alone attribute table

Long-term the Parcel Framework Work Group will need to determine what the product should look like (be normalized across the state, etc.)

Data Agreements

One potential value of the statewide parcel framework effort is to establish data sharing

agreements as opposed to data license agreements

An important part of this process is for the state and federal agencies to clarify what they can offer the counties in exchange for sharing county parcel data, i.e. what data and/or products produced by state and federal agencies would be of use to the counties?

For example: Wildland fire protection saves lives and property. County parcel/assessor data provides the necessary information to reduce response time

Thus far the Parcels Framework Work Group has written a draft charter but has yet to do the necessary outreach to counties

This agreement may feed into the Census long-term because it may be useful for the counties to have the Census using their data

Process

It would be helpful for the Parcel Framework Work Group to understand the process that Luke is using in his current efforts

WATRANS (roads framework group) has established areas where counties match up – this may help the Parcels Framework Work Group to identify where the parcels should meet up

Accuracy

There was some discussion over issues of data accuracy

Some group members expressed that the group should work towards increasing parcel data accuracy (engaging the survey community, etc.)

Others expressed that this may tie up the process and/or frustrate the counties

There exists an apparent conflict between the goal of distribution (i.e. “just get it done and out”) and increasing accuracy of the source data over time

Charter

The bulk of the meeting was spent discussing the draft charter

David will email revised copies of the charter to group members

The charter needs to include a schedule – target dates, phases

Key Goals and Objectives

Need to ensure a strong consensus

Need to specify data format (ESRI – shapefile, geodatabase; projection)

Establish a format for deliverables based on the needs of the framework group participants

Specify that the project involves state, county, *and* federal agencies

Address issues of accessibility – webservice, etc.

Specify that FGDC metadata standards should be followed

Identify update frequency, process

Long-term Objectives

Identify and have ISB approve the “standards” for parcel data coverage

Establish process for update and distribution of the dataset

Benefits to Data Users and Data Providers

An associated increase in value added products are expected as parcel data is more widely used
Sharing parcel through a coordinated distribution system reduces the operational costs in the local assessor's office and within state/federal agencies by reducing calls

State applications that don't use the most accurate or current data potentially have a negative impact on the counties

Success Factors

Coordinate with other framework management groups (roads - WATRANS, hydrology, ortho imagery)

The cadastral framework group is in maintenance mode now

Specify what to do for counties that don't have parcel data in GIS (about 6) – there needs to be a process by which to work with these counties

Decision Making Process

No decision was reached on a decision making process.

The group will need to determine who is a voting member and a process by which voting should take place in the event that consensus is not reached on a given issue (for example: Each agency present at the meeting will have one vote)

It was acknowledged that the meeting agenda sent out in advance should specify if a key vote is expected to take place at the meeting so the group members can prioritize attending the meeting

Deliverables

Ongoing communication with stakeholders including state agencies, WAGIC, Framework Management Group via periodic reports and/or presentations

Parcel Data Consumers Survey Summary

Copies of the Summary of Consumer Survey were made available

Parcel Data Producers Survey

Copies of the Parcel Data Producers Survey were made available

Action Items

The charter should go beyond specifying data issues - it should relate how a parcel framework will further the business needs and missions of the entities involved. As part of this each agency needs to make their business benefits clear.

Each agency should address the following questions:

1. Business needs
2. What the organization can offer the counties in return for their parcel data
3. What the organization produces based on the county parcels

Future Meetings

The group agreed to meet on a monthly basis

The process may eventually necessitate the creation of sub-groups that meet more frequently and/or in addition to the regular monthly meetings

Dates were scheduled for the next three meetings. Joy expressed that the NRB room in which the group has been meeting is not ideal. Ideally the meeting room should have a phone line for people to conference in. David offered the DOH building Tumwater and Gordon (WSDOT) offered WSDOT's Tumwater Office Building. The May meeting will be held at DOH in Tumwater.

May 23, 9:00 – 11:00 am, DOH Tumwater (David to confirm location information)

June 20, 9:00 – 11:00 am

July 18, 9:00 – 11:00 am

Additional Information