**Attendees:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Anne Kawalec | Ada County Assessor |
| Chris Corwin* | Blaine County |
| Dennis Hill | City of Pocatello |
| Donna Pitzer | Bureau of Reclamation |
| Gail Ewart | Idaho Geospatial Office (IGO) |
| Gary Wilbert | Idaho Power (IPCO) |
| Jack Clark | Ada County |
| Michael Ciscell | Idaho Department of Water Resources |
| Michele Porter | Bureau of Land Management |
| Sarah Higuera* | Canyon County |
| Scott van Hoff | US Geological Survey |
| Wilma Robertson | Idaho Geospatial Office (IGO) |

*\* Connected via phone and GoToMeeting*


**Introductions and Logistics**

Gail introduced Wilma Robertson as the new Framework Coordinator.

**ISDI Update – Gail Ewart**

The ISDI will soon be branded as The Idaho Map (TIM): Official reveal will be done during the Forum in Pocatello on June 24, 2010.


Executive Strategy Session on Data Sharing:

This session, which was spearheaded by Mike Gwartney and facilitated by Gail Ewart, took place on June 1, 2010 and was attended by Tom Katsilometes, Mike Gwartney, Greg Zickau and other senior executives from various agencies. The session focused on ways to elevate the profile, or "silhouette," of the Idaho Map, focusing on Parcels and data sharing issues, in a way that makes it more compelling to decision makers. After being presented with a business case for Parcel Framework, Dir. Gwartney suggested that the Governor would champion the effort publicly. Gail described the meeting as a balanced discussion between data sharing issues and possible ways to secure stable funding.

Anne mentioned an insightful keynote address by Hernando de Soto (see http://www.esri.com/events/uc-videos/agenda/plenary.html near the bottom of the webpage) explaining why the cadastral database is so important to economic development. Anne suggested that it would be very beneficial to show this to the Governor (or a shortened summary of this address).

One of the action items for Gail is to write a two-page business case, and she may need the input of the Parcel workgroup. Gail told the executives that about $1M per year is needed to adequately fund the effort and that the best fit for the program would be the Idaho Tax Commission. Of the current suggestions for funding, the $1 mapping fee added to assessment notices was the favored approach initially. Gail was requested to provide our earlier draft legislation that increases recording fees as the funding mechanism.

Gail stressed it was important to deal with data sharing issues and funding issues at the same time. Since we are asking counties to go beyond their minimum statutory requirements, additional resources are appropriate.

Other: In preparation for the kick-off of the new Government Boundaries TWG we are looking into the processes required to change legal boundaries that are incorrect.

**ACSM Conference and Federal Parcel Working Group – Donna Pitzer**

ACSM stands for American Congress on Surveying & Mapping. Donna mentioned some interesting presentations and papers, specifically the one presented by John Stahl, PLS, "The Surveyor's Role in Boundary Conflict Resolution," about the Surveyor's role in boundary resolutions.

A Federal Parcels Working group exists (see: http://nationalcad.org/projects.asp?projectid=15&navsrc=Projects). Doug Vandergraft invited Donna to be a Project Member. However, since Doug Vandegraft has recently taken a position elsewhere, Donna is not on the working group (yet). It would be good if Donna could be a member as there are no other BOR participants currently on the working group. It looks like this group is still relatively new, and only once conference call has taken place so far.

Parcel Standards – Parcel Standards Sub-Committee

The group was very impressed and excited to be at this stage with a first draft of the Idaho Parcel Framework Standard completed! "Way to go" to Michael, Sarah, Michele and Gary!

Every TWG has to go through several phases, each with a specific goal and specific documentation. The phases are: (1) Action plans (2) Standard and (3) Stewardship. It is important to understand that the Standards define an end product while the Stewardship component defines the process on how to achieve this end product. This distinction was kept in mind when discussing the Standards.

Michael Ciscell prepared a Framework Issues sheet that was followed during the discussion. Note that the items on the Issues sheet are printed in *italics* while the discussion during the TWG meeting is interjected in regular font.

1. *Use geodatabase to access each Steward/provider's data individually. Common attributes would allow for easy merge of information.*

    - Need to keep in mind that some Counties do not use ESRI products. May need to accommodate shapefiles derived from CAD files.

2. *Federal/State/Tribal feature classes would be in separate feature classes and possibly overlap county data*

    - Does the term "Parcel" apply to the sometimes really large polygons found in the Federal/State/Tribal Databases?

    - The parcel framework will have 44 feature classes, one for each County, and a 45th for Federal/State/Tribal parcels. Federal parcels are provided by the BLM and State parcels are maintained by GIO.

    - It is not a goal to provide one seamless map of all the parcels in the State, or to fix edging errors between or within different sources of parcel data. Several agencies, such as IDWR and IPCO will process the parcel data to their own specifications for their own internal use.

3. *At this time, the Parcel_ID (PIN) would be the only County information maintained on the Framework Layers.*

4. *Parcel_ID is not required to be filled in, for county or other feature classes*

    - Counties that do not want to share their Parcel ID are not required to. The bare minimum requirement is a closed polygon.

    - Gary Wilbert mentions that all counties that share geometry with IPCO also all share their Parcel ID.

    - Federal/State/Tribal parcels may not have a Parcel ID.

5. *Additional attribute information from counties would be stored as files within the geodatabase or as individual files within a directory structure*

    - Other data can be stored in the geodatabase and be linked to the geometry using Parcel ID as a primary Key. Dennis Hill mentioned that a situs address might be a better primary key. Michele Porter commented that both Parcel ID and situs address should be in the schema and that the metadata should indicate which one of those two attributes should be used as a primary key if additional tables are available.

6. *No requirement to have additional attribute information in order to provide spatial information*

7. *Discuss common attribute names and definitions not truncated/affected by .dbf limitations*

    - There should be a broader discussion about attribute names across different frameworks. For example the attribute "GIS_STEW" needs to be consistent among different framework themes. Similarly, it is important to

have consistent definitions of "Steward", "Source Steward" and "Data Provider" among different framework themes. Those definitions should be defined at a higher level in the ISDI.

- Shapefiles are still limited to a 10-character attribute name. Personal Geodatabases allow longer names. Michele expressed a preference to keeping attributes names to a 10-character limit.

- Shapefiles may not be around much longer. Issues may arise with the lack of backward compatibility of geodatabases (e.g. an ArcGIS 10 geodatabase cannot be viewed by ArcGIS 9.3 software). Michele mentioned that this might not be an issue if the data can be exported in different formats to data consumers.

- The first iteration of the parcel data is for a GIS audience who use this data in their agency's processes. Future iterations should be geared towards the public at large, which would please legislators.

8. *Discuss whether some additional attribute information fields be kept on the Framework layers through not necessarily filled in*

9. *Discuss whether to embed County name into the Federal/State/Tribal layers. What about specific National Forest designations (i.e. Boise National Forest, Payette National Forest) in Steward/Provider/Jurisdiction?*

- Since some Federal/State/Tribal parcels are huge, adding a Counties field would help subdivide a parcel into smaller polygons. This could also be done on a Township basis.

*Other comments*

- The standard states that all polygons must be single part. Many parcels are multipart. Is this an issue?

- Having blank fields in the database may put pressure on, and scare away, potential Stewards. On the other hand, a little pressure may get Counties to provide that data.

- Metadata (especially the FGDC style sheet) may scare away Counties. Clearly define minimum metadata requirements and make it easy for Stewards to complete the metadata.

- Donna talked about the definition of Cadastral being "any interest or right to a piece of land".  Where do mineral rights fit into this context? This appears to be a good topic for future iterations of the Parcel Framework.

Email comments about the Idaho Parcel Framework Standard document to Michael.Ciscell@idwr.idaho.gov, shiguera@canyonco.org, Michele_Porter@blm.gov and GWilbert@idahopower.com (send to all 4) before June 15, 2010. The parcels sub-committee will present the next draft of the Idaho parcel Framework Standards during the next Parcels TWG meeting.

Next Meeting

The next Parcels TWG meeting is on July 1, 2010.