

**Parcel Workgroup Meeting Minutes  
February 4, 2010  
9:00 AM – 11:30 AM**

**Attendees:**

Gail Ewart	Idaho DoA/OCIO/IGO
Anne Kawalec	Ada County Assessor
Craig Rindlisbacher	Madison County/City of Rexburg
Dixie Booker-Lair	Idaho Department of Lands
Donna Pitzer	Bureau of Reclamation
Gary Wilbert	Idaho Power (IPCO)
Jeff Servatius	Idaho State Tax Commission
Ken Pidjeon	
Michael Ciscell	Idaho Department of Water Resources
Michele Porter	Bureau of Land Management
Walt Bulawa	Idaho State Tax Commission
Wendy Eklund	Idaho Department of Fish & Game

**On the phone:**

Dawn Leatham – Bonneville County  
 Gary Young – Bureau of Reclamation  
 Kristin Maughan – Dig Line, Inc.  
 Sherry Lufkin – Jefferson County

**INTRODUCTIONS AND LOGISTICS – ANNE KAWALEC**

**BRIEF HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF THE GROUP – DONNA PITZER, Chair of the Cadastral & Geodetic Control Group:**



(Click on graphic to view the framework document)  
<http://gis.idaho.gov/framework.htm>

About 2 years ago, the Cadastral & Geodetic Control Group was subdivided:

- Cadastral Reference Focus Group (Deals with the GCDB)
- Parcels Focus Group

Update of the Cadastral Reference Focus Group:

- We are looking at putting up a control point inventory database where surveyors can submit their own controls points to be used for various purposes. Surveyors can use this for research and storing their own control information.
- We have a couple of pilot projects where the GCDB is going to be recalculated and improved in Eastern Idaho (Freemont, Madison and Teton) counties and in Washington County in western Idaho.

**Review of the Vision – Anne Kawalec:**

THE VISION (created two years ago)

WE HAVE A STATEWIDE PARCEL BASEMAP THAT IS...

- Mutually beneficial to both the data producers and the data consumers.
- Seamless across the state.
- Secure and appropriately shared.
- Publicly accessible with geometry and core attributes.
- Current and continually maintained.
- Supportive a multi-purpose land information system.

- Based on appropriate state and national standards.
- Improved over time.

Michael Ciscell, IDWR, has created a statewide parcel basemap for use within IDWR. With some limitations and keeping in mind that the parcels are only for use within IDWR, he has created just what we have described in the vision statement.

Michael was asked to demonstrate the parcel basemap and give us an overview of how he got the data, how he uses the data, and how he maintains the data. He has offered the IDWR statewide parcel data as a start in our effort to build a statewide parcel basemap. Of course, it would be dependent on the approval of each Assessor.

**IDWR STATEWIDE PARCELS – MICHAEL CISCELL:**

About 13 years ago when Michael returned to IDWR, he was in charge of GIS development in the Snake River Basin Adjudication. One of the things that IDWR needed for adjudicating water rights was parcel information. Michael called around the state and found that there were only about 3 or 4 counties that had digital parcel information. Outside of Ada County and a few others, everyone had paper maps.

This was not going to work for the digital information that was needed. It was determined that budget monies from the adjudication could be used for general contracting efforts to support the adjudication. Some of these monies were used to encourage Counties to develop a digital parcel layer for their county. IDWR set up contracts, talked with Counties to determine how they wanted to collect the data, what software they wanted to use, what their registration would be. The Counties needed to be able to provide IDWR with a shapefile containing a parcel id number (PIN) and some minimal attribute information. This attribute data is described below.

Over the past 10 years, IDWR has contracted/collaborated with, provided funding to about 26 of the counties across the state, to help them develop their data and has offered a variety of mutually beneficial services such as converting CAD information to a more standard GIS format. As a result of IDWR’s efforts to reach out to Counties, they have a mostly complete statewide layer. Butte and Valley counties and Forest Service land in Central Idaho are the largest gaps. Now Valley County is using ArcGIS and is about half way done. Gary Wilbert from Idaho Power has been working with Valley County and they seem willing to share the data too.

IDWR receives updates, on an average of once a year. This is dependent on IDWR staff needed for adjudication. Once County parcel data is received, IDWR will reproject them and extract only the required attribute data:

<b>ATTRIBUTE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Updated	Date last contacted the county
PIN	parcel id number
Owner	To contact people about water rights.
Address	To contact people about water rights.
City	To contact people about water rights.
State	To contact people about water rights.
Zip	To contact people about water rights.
P_Address	we get from the Assessors
P_zipcode	we get from Assessors
Legal 1 – 6	Legal Descriptions
Acres	GIS Acres – Calculated acres
County	
Source	May be county, city, etc.
Year_Built	Example: When the house was built
ParcelCoun	IDWR use. If they had a water right, this helps with well construction permitting.

Currently there are about 1 million 32 thousand polygons in this parcel layer. When new data is received, they swap out those counties data for the updated information. IDWR does not do geometric edge

matching between counties and as such there are gaps and overlaps. There just isn't time to do this statewide.

In regards to federal lands, Counties do not have a standard naming convention, they account for federal lands in different ways with different names. If a County has not collected federal ownership information, we will take the surface management layer provided by the BLM, overlay it with the parcel layer and then we will transfer to the GCDB quarter quarter information. In most of the counties we will dissolve the federal ownership to the section. We do not put PINS on the federal land, because we do not have this information.

Regarding distribution of this data, we don't! We will have people call us to request data and we have to say no. IDWR advises the requestor to call the County for permission to receive data from IDWR. We can release the data only if the county has provided (you/us) written permission. As an example, Dixie from IDL knows that IDWR has received parcel data and asks for the Elmore County parcel layer from IDWR. If permission is granted in writing from the County, then we can cut a DVD and send it to IDL.

*Craig* – asks if Michael receives separate attribute data.

*Michael* replies, sometimes. They receive data both ways. When the attribute data is in an additional file, IDWR needs to process the data.

*Craig* – asked because of the year built.

*Michael* – Yes, the year built is not in the standard table. For the AS400 users we ask for year built and the PIN.

*Sheldon* - asked what projection Michael receives data in and what projection is your map in?

*Michael's* response was that most of the county data is in state plane so typically 3 different projections; we project to IDTM83 in the case of this data, then attach a template (attributes as listed above) and export out and attach any other data from the county, then calculate the fields and drop any joins fields they don't use. We publish to our internal data servers, our other 4 district offices throughout the state.

The other thing we use the data for is for web applications. IDWR has developed three different applications, one of them being the ([Irrigation District and Water Rights Finder](#)) web application. With this application, any person can put in a PIN number and it will zoom into that area. The user can then see IDWR's data underneath the PIN. This site allows the public to search by placing a point on a web map or drawing a box around an area. The returned information will be points of diversion or place of use, and the user can see if there is a right available for purchase.

The [Northern Idaho Adjudication \(NIA\) – has an online application](#). As a part of the NIA application process online, if an applicant puts in their parcel id number, the application zooms to that parcel. The applicant can enter, mark up the location of the requesting point of diversion and place of use or has the option to use the parcel itself as the place of use.

Some issues: a PIN may span across multiple parcels, this is the same until the owner sells or if we haven't gotten a PIN from the counties. When this span occurs, we show the whole subdivision. This is where the parcel count attribute field comes into play in the parcel layer.

We also use the PIN number for an application we are putting together for our flood plain. This will be used to show FEMA flood plain maps.

*Donna* – in your attribute table you have URL address for the County websites.

*Michael* – Yes, we can hang the county website off of the parcel map. The user may in the future be able to go to the county website application such as the ones in Ada, Canyon, Boise and Custer Counties. The county applications show more information that is county specific.

Michael has been talking to Gail, Anne, and Donna about the possibility of county assessors accepting a website/serve that shows the geometry and the PIN, but would not carry any personal information. You could allow people to enter PIN and zoom to your data. This may be a starting point. There should not be a problem if all we are showing is the PIN and the last time the data was updated.

*Gary Young* – the nature of the data that I would be interested in is the owner type i.e. private, or public. This would be of considerable value.

*Sheldon* – I noticed that you do not have assessed value in your attributes. If you look at the assessor data and see an assessed value of 0 this means that most of that is government, but can also be churches, hospitals, etc. that is tax exempt.

*Gail* – County Assessors are showing a greater willingness to share their data under certain conditions. Donna, Anne and Gail have talked to County Officials, County Assessors, and IAC. They are receptive to figuring out ways to do this. What we have talked to them about is sharing with governments with a certain set of agreed upon attributes, and then perhaps sharing more broadly with a reduced set of attributes. At last count, there were about 40 counties that are willing to do this. The other thing that is driving this is there isn't enough money or human resources available to keep doing what we currently must do. State agencies are gathering and integrating parcels 4 to 6 times individually, and the counties have to service each request. Speaking on behalf of the State, the state government is one entity. Treating us as individual departments or agencies makes this overly complicated. We would like to have one agreement that is on behalf of all state agencies that would facilitate sharing for as many counties that are willing to do that. We can talk about what consideration might be made in return. For governments at least, we have to crack this egg because it is costing us all too much to carry on the same, and we all desperately need this data to carry out our routine missions and our extraordinary missions. The Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security within the Military Division, Colonel Bill Shawver, says parcels are the most important data they need to meet their mission. Michael's example of how this can be done at Water Resources is something that we could leverage. As something that is already there, that would be a light touch on everyone involved, to make it visible to more people under an agreement within the government and to see how many counties we can get an agreement to that. Also, recently Governor Otter reiterated on his commitment to reduce inefficiency in government. This is one area where we can really help in a big way. This would free up time for folks to do agency business. Gail thinks we can move forward immediately.

*Sheldon* - How many person hours are you devoting to this task to maintain this?

*Michael* - If we were to get annual updates, it is a few hours per county. What we have here is not a complex SDE. It is not a versioned geodatabase.

*Craig* – Does the STC have something similar? Yes. Lands has something similar. BLM has something similar, Fish and Game has collected similar data. Gail's office has some data for IPRS.

*Anne* – This is duplication of effort, but just at different scales.

*Michael* – From our perspective, anyone can host this. This is maintained by our staff. IDWR could continue to maintain this and ship to Tax Commission. In the IDWR contract with the counties, the county provides annual updates. Custer, Ada, sends updates. Canyon, Jefferson we download their data. Bear lake changes. Most county's data would be fairly easy to get. Some counties have waivers. We try to get whatever we can get. Owner, address and PIN. To be able to provide PINS to anyone shouldn't be a problem for any county. We have been at his for so long.

*Craig* – What would help you make a better map version of this?

*Michael* – Valley county and Butte county data added to this. Within the next year this should be more complete.

*Donna* – IDWR does not do any edge matching, correct?

*Michael* – Yes and this is ok. If people need data even tighter, we would have to take care of that down the road. Most of the counties use GCDB, so it matches pretty well.

### **Review of the Goals and Objectives – Anne Kawalec:**

Along with the vision, the group had put together a list of goals and objectives. The ideas were never prioritized or officially accepted by the group.

<http://gis.idaho.gov/framework/cadastral/ParcelVisionGoalsObjectives.htm>

Several of the goals have already been accomplished with the Strategic Plan for Development and Deployment of Idaho's Spatial Data Infrastructure.

- Gail worked very hard to get statewide input on how the ISDI should be developed.
- We also have a very good idea of the status of parcel databases across the state as a result of the survey that Jeff Servatius sent out to the Assessor's in Idaho.

### **Leadership Team Meetings:**

The leadership team has met with various groups to promote the ISDI and discuss possible funding mechanisms for the parcel framework.

- Presentations were given at the regional IAC meetings over the summer.
- At the request of the Governor and the Director of the Dept of Administration, Gail put together a white paper on funding mechanisms for the parcel framework.
- Gail spoke at the Clerk, Auditor, and Recorder annual meeting to go over the ISDI and get some ideas for possible funding of the parcel framework.
- The leadership team, along with Assessor Robert McQuade, met with Commissioner Tom Katsilometes (STC) to promote the idea of a statewide parcel framework. Tom K has had past experience putting together a statewide E911 database and was supportive of the ideas that we discussed. He recommended that we speak one-on-one with the Assessor's to get their support.

### **Discussion on the future meetings for the Parcel Work Group:**

- Gail suggested that we develop a plan with incremental milestones on the way to our goal.
- Anne asked if everyone would be available to meet more often to work on this project. It was agreed that we would meet on the first Thursday of each month in the BOR conference room when possible.
- Topics (incremental milestones) for our next meetings:
  - *Needs assessment* – we will create a survey to determine what everyone actually needs with the basemap. We will start with Federal, State, and local government offices.
    - Some of this is already in the business plan.
    - We will attempt to reduce redundancy within governmental workflows in an attempt to save taxpayer dollars.
    - We will leave the 'tiered' approach that would include private industry for our later discussions.
  - *Data Sharing Agreements* -
    - Who will use the data?
    - What will the data be used for?
    - We will need to include disclaimers to assure that the data is not 'misused'.
      - The Eastern Idaho Regional GIS group is attempting to put together one agreement that will work for their group. Craig will keep us up-to-date on their findings.
  - *Legal/Legislative issues* – Sheldon will discuss Idaho Code at our next meeting.
  - *Method for distributing the data.*
    - Will a web service work?

### **Action Items:**

- Members were asked to read several documents before the next meeting:
  - <http://gis.idaho.gov/framework.htm>
    - The Strategic Plan for Development and Deployment of Idaho's Spatial Data Infrastructure
    - Framework Stewardship Charter Template
    - ISDI Framework Stewardship
- Jeff Servatius will discuss the Election Consolidation Bill and show a web application that the STC has created to help in future elections.
- Sheldon will give a presentation on Idaho Code and legislation regarding parcel data requests.

**Next Meeting: March 4<sup>th</sup>, 9 – 11:30 a.m., Bureau of Reclamation**