

4/16/08

1

## Parcel Waking group

Description of how FME works + the utility for integrating the Parcels data

UW donating for 1 yr may have to pay in future  
being done on desktop but this process can go to a server where ETL happens when providers submit online

Run + tested several alternatives

run for each set receive all built off same core model, each county dif as long as structure doesn't change can keep re-running

Servers ~ 2? prepare for future needs <sup>perhaps ArcGIS</sup>

develop in parallel so can be prepared

### Statement of Intent

some comments from Clallam Co Assessor  
concern about non-normalized data  
shared w/partners if need non-norm go to county

Temporal D's ~> might need attribute table to

match geometry of creation

plan to keep historic non-normalized data

don't want to become redistributor / data warehouse

don't want people getting it for free need the stream

Concerns about setting up complex scenarios we cannot maintain

What value does the state buy in?

efficiency, reduce duplicative investment benefit COs - more exposure of state value added products tied to parcels - ↓ requests from state

Report put together from survey telling us what the value added products from state agencies → can show this w/ CO's that help provide data

Outreach? - attend CO assessment mtg talking to individual Co. help pay consultants to help Co improve data liaison from Cowlitz

Will be able to comment on whole packet? we could. Letter, Questionnaire on how proceed Statement of Intent, list value added County specific what did w/ letter

Concerns about this slowing the process

→ This is not intended for this packet perhaps reminding them about what they get perhaps mail for those COs pushing back, only share value-added one on one as needed

Really think majority of COs will be happy concern this value add piece would slow down the process, not enough staff time → request for people to help = no one volunteered

Columbia, Lewis, Yaki man <sup>can't get a response</sup>  
 Liaison has tried to help  
 was interested in participating  
 haven't been able to get started again  
 very concerned about outdated data  
 very concerned about privacy  
 keep demonstrating

Suggestion on Plain Talk Edit - Take these as suggestions

historical non-normal data  
 → concerned about scope-creep  
 not comfortable in short-term  
 to be successful in short term → not  
 sure we can manage this  
 logistically → significant work increase  
 historical non-normalized dataset will be  
 stored. Not sure how will store + redistribute.  
 In short term this will not be available  
 PWG be clear you will not be able to  
 rely on this any time soon. Perhaps in  
 future phases.  
 Should we remove the sentence?  
 Counties don't store this perhaps have  
 sentence so don't mislead counties  
 This can be a service for counties  
 perhaps couch <sup>this</sup> as a data archive for the counties

(2) (4)

reasonable to have in there. This covers us. Archiving raises other issues

↳ same for one-on-one if needed

Cowling: his concerns should be waived by our most recent edits. Only normalized data final product for public disclosure requests not the "working docs" i.e. non-normalized data.

Luke will present to AAG@ University

Signed by participating?

↳ perhaps just sign as co-chairs of PWG instead of having all members of WG having to find who can sign from the agency

Be clear on who is participating

↳ update the page on the web

---

Data Updates - do every aug best

time of year for Assessors

Jan/Feb would be good for 2x/yr if/when get there

Now - FOCUS on Aug collect

Sep/Oct Integrate

State wide Cov w/ Attributes? ~ Size ~> definitely

under 4GB ~> don't know actual size, 1<sup>st</sup> distribution

might be DVDs until get Java working

too big for an Access DB. Distributing actual

DB will get tough need to figure out some

of these technical hurdles

Web-based service → not too much of a problem w/ small # people in this group a larger issue to manage, but could end up not being too much of a big deal. Longu Run

— This is more efficient, could use off servers or download open to suggestions... Perhaps next mtg ~

show what systems will be consuming this we need to know what your needs are. how you intend to be using this. Everyone needs to go back + talk to their technical people to make sure do-able.

ACTION

Would be good to know what can do, what formats that would be avail.

Try Brainstorm then decide what

→ Talk to WA-Trangs about how distributing their data ~ Try Michael L.

Potential for ArcGIS Server? Use of CO. cookie cutters chop up by county as more distributable or by regional if service create views of counties it is relational, do people want this flat?

Send to counties soon

we have been meeting Monthly still seem to have stuff to come

6

more meetings still in short term

in a few MOs may be able to ↓ frequency

finalized SOI draft

Like finalizing individual country

if don't hear acceptable

couple mos before can start distributing

where conversation has reached

Action → what format do you need

how do you see yourself consuming  
webservice, on DVD,

Major topic for next mtg - you have responsibility to go talk about this

**ESRI** com talk next mtg about potential mechanism

Should each group be serving? <sup>Framework</sup> put it in one place  
portal not up. GIT is talking about this OrthoImage needs to play out first

Format probably most important issue

we have made short term access decision to have potential to have thison servers @ UW. future

phase we can move this into a state-run website in a year or two. This goes toward long-term governance

fitting into statewide EA @ ISB

Future agenda → Budget - will be a range / Cost analysis on how much State

is saving - WATrans did this ROI GIT recognized cost savings even w/o Cost Ben. This should increase quality of what working w/ Even just a simple Stat. Probably need to do this when become formal

7

PwG ~ 4/16/08

Why not Framework?

we aren't telling COs how to collect  
just combining

~~the~~ GIT asked same question  
will turn it over to the frame M Group  
currently scope too narrow

how does this compare to WATrans?  
↳ This should be examined

ACTION

Can you show something?  
set of questions  
what have you

so people have something to go back to  
DBAs w/

Luke can provide something  
perhaps word doc w/ weblinks

where are we on how use these parcels?  
reg put on maps for public use?

know can't distribute digital  
be explicit when working w/ counties  
Arc / MS Service

This raises good questions geometry - parcel # -  
owner name -

↳ implies level of precision not in the data  
↳ need to be able to tell the user

could find errors + show w/CO

↳ COs know their issues ~ pretty much