



Summary

MetroGIS Regional Parcel Data Users Forum

**September 25, 2003
1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.**

**John Rose Skating Facility
Roseville, MN**

*Prepared by: Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council-GIS Unit)
and Randall Johnson (MetroGIS)*

In Brief: On September 25, 2003, MetroGIS hosted a Peer Review Forum to identify desired enhancements to the regional parcel dataset. A packet of information was sent to each participant prior to the forum, to help them focus on needs related to parcel data. The 14 individuals attending the forum were then asked to describe their unmet business needs related to parcels and property and vote for priority enhancements. Participants represented a broad perspective of dataset users, including local school districts, watershed districts, cities, counties, regional and state agencies and academia. On a scale of 1 to 4 (4 being the highest), the participants rated the value of the forum as 3.42 (Appendix A) in terms of usefulness to their respective needs. The forum presentation slides are provided in Appendix D.

FORUM AGENDA

MetroGIS Regional Parcel Data Users Forum

September 25, 2003

John Rose Skating Center
West of Roseville City Hall (County Road C and Lexington Avenue)
1 to 3:30 p.m.

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Registration | 12:45-1:00 |
| 2. Welcome and Introductions - <i>Victoria Reinhardt, Chair MetroGIS Policy Board</i> | 1:00 |
| 3. Purpose of Today's Forum - <i>Mark Kotz, MetroGIS Staff Support Team (Metropolitan Council)</i> | 1:15 |
| 4. Brief History of Regional Parcel Dataset - <i>Kotz</i> | 1:20 |
| 5. Current Uses of the Regional Parcel Dataset | 1:35 |
| ▪ Dick Carlstrom – TIES (School District Consortium) | |
| ▪ Nancy Read – Metropolitan Mosquito Control District | |
| ▪ Jason Podany – Metro Transit | |
| 6. Process for Remainder of Today – Identifying Desired Enhancements - <i>Kotz</i> | 1:50 |
| BREAK 2:00 | |
| 7. Identify Desired Enhancements - <i>Group Exercise</i> | 2:15 |
| BREAK 3:00
(staff to setup for voting) | |
| 8. Identify Priorities - <i>Group Exercise</i> | 3:10 |
| 9. Wrap-up & Next Step - <i>Kotz</i> | 3:25 |

ATTENDEES

In late August, each of the 45 licensed users of the Regional Parcel dataset received an invitation (Appendix B) to participate in this forum from Victoria Reinhardt, Chair of the MetroGIS Policy Board. Staff then followed up via telephone and email to further encourage participation. The intent was to secure participation by individuals with the broadest organizational and professional perspectives possible. The following individuals participated:

Participants

Dick Carlstrom
John Carpenter
Pete Eggimann
Brad Ellis
Tim Leach
Chad Martini
Michael Munson
Rick Person
Ned Phillips
Jason Podany
Nancy Read
Bart Richardson
Jay Thompson
Jim Von Haden

Organization

Technology Information Educational Services (TIES)
Excensus, LLC (Representing Washington County HRA)
Metropolitan 911 Board
U of M, Humphrey Institute, Urban/Regional Planning Program
Metropolitan Council Environmental Services
Minnesota Dept. of Transportation
Metropolitan Council
City of St. Paul
Rice Creek Watershed District
Metro Transit
Metropolitan Mosquito Control District
Minnesota Dept. of Natural Resources
Three Rivers Park District (formerly Hennepin Parks)
Mississippi National River & Recreation Area

Observers

Dave Brandt
Curt Peterson
Jim Hentges
Gary Swenson
Bill Brown
Bob Moulder
Dan Falbo

Organization

Washington County
Ramsey County
Scott County
Anoka County
Hennepin County
Hennepin County
ESRI

Staff

Mark Kotz - Facilitator
Solveig Berg - Recorder
Randall Johnson

Organization

Metropolitan Council
Metropolitan Council
MetroGIS

WELCOME

At 1:00 p.m., Victoria Reinhardt, Chair of the MetroGIS Policy Board, welcomed the participants and thanked them for participating, also emphasizing the importance of the forum to MetroGIS's core functions.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE REGIONAL PARCEL DATASET

Mark Kotz, MetroGIS Staff Support Team and member of the Metropolitan Council GIS Unit, explained that the purpose of today's forum is to define and prioritize enhancements to the Regional Parcel Dataset that meet the business needs of the users. Kotz showed that there is a cycle for regional data solutions involving reaching consensus on regional components, building or acquiring the data and monitoring

satisfaction, which is the reason for this forum. Kotz then briefly described the workgroups and events that led to the current Regional Parcel Dataset.

He also summarized the metadata for this dataset and explained the 2 methods for distributing it –FTP and DataFinder Café.

CURRENT USES OF THE REGIONAL PARCEL DATASET

Three current users of the regional parcel dataset provided some examples of how they use it - Dick Carlstrom, with TIES, (for school uses); Jason Podany, with Metro Transit; and Nancy Read with the Metro Mosquito Control District. See Appendix D for slides.

PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING AND PRIORITIZING ENHANCEMENTS

Kotz explained the process for defining and prioritizing information needs, asking participants not to simply focus on what can be improved with the current dataset, but to think more broadly about their business needs related to parcel data. He noted that the parcel workgroup can then translate these needs into specific enhancements to the dataset.

Kotz asked participants to respond to this statement and keep in mind the variety of possible parcel needs, including those related to attributes, geography, temporal uses, documentation, and distribution.

In order to meet my organization's business needs, I need to know the following about parcels and property....

The participants were then asked to write down their top three (or more) information needs related to parcels. A roundtable exercise then followed where each participant explained one of their needs. Each was recorded on a chart at the front of the room. Once all participants had mentioned one need, each was then asked to share another need (that hadn't already been mentioned). The process continued until all of the information needs important to the participants had been shared and recorded. Any information needs that were raised but which the group agreed were out of scope related to the regional parcel dataset were recorded in a "parking lot" to be forwarded to an appropriate group for consideration.

The next phase of the forum involved prioritizing the needs from a group perspective. Each participant was given five dots and asked to vote for five different needs as priorities. This was done by placing dots next to those needs on the flip charts. Users were asked not to put multiple dots on a single need. The reason for doing this was to get a better understanding of the breadth of common needs. Attendees were not required to use all five dots. Participants were also asked to write "critical" on any dot that identified a mission critical information need for their organization. Dots were color coded to distinguish among three groups. They are:

1. Local government
2. Regional government
3. State & federal government and academic institutions

Kotz facilitated the exercise and asked observers from the counties (primary producers of parcel data) to provide comments and ask questions to clarify needs.

IDENTIFYING DESIRED ENHANCEMENTS

This table attempts to capture some of the dialogue from the roundtable exercise and to summarize the information needs shared by the participants. Additional information is provided in the Results table in the next section of this document.

Name	Organization	I need to know the following about parcels and property...
John Carpenter	Excensus, LLC	Units counts.
Pete Eggimann	Metro 911 Board	Address / location of a building (units within building / building footprint) and all addresses within that building. Important for wireless E-911. Need address at a specific point.
Nancy Read	Metro Mosquito Control District	Parcel boundaries with all owners first and last names. Person who has rights to define treatment on parcel including resident & property address.
Tim Leach	Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	Use type/zoning - 1 st level residential /commercial/industrial 2 nd level multiple / single dwelling. Change in use over time.
Brad Ellis	University of Minnesota	Number of occupants/residents per parcel. (placed in parking lot socioeconomic needs workgroup.
Ned Phillips	Rice Creek Watershed District	Attribute consistency across region. Mailing and situs addresses (mailing US postal address)
Michael Munson	Metropolitan Council	Mixed uses. Change in uses, annual file. Historical archives to be able to review changes over time – distribution question. Building & land value & uses. New development units/structure.
Chad Martini	MN Dept. of Transportation (Mn/DOT)	Size of parcel. Planning level GIS, so calculated area OK as opposed to deeded acreage.
Bart Richardson	MN Dept. of Natural Resources (MN DNR)	Public property ownership by type.
Jim Von Haden	National Park Service	Missing values for owner names. More specific about public owner (agency) Conservation easements. Provide predefined custom polygon for downloading.
Rick Person	City of St. Paul	Pass – needs already mentioned.
Jason Podany	Metro Transit	Boulevard width
Dick Carlstrom	TIES	Addresses of apartment units.
Jay Thompson	Three Rivers Park District	Pass – needs already mentioned.
John Carpenter	Excensus, LLC	More extensive housing attributes, including: Housing type: e.g. townhouse, apartments, condominium, duplex, Home style: e.g. rambler, 2 story, Cape Cod. Square footage living area.; Number of bedrooms
Pete Eggimann	Metro 911 Board	Vanity address (ID) All addresses, all buildings on a parcel. (130 3M Way) Addresses for each building.
Nancy Read	Metro Mosquito Control District	Who has Rights to Property? Lease hold interests. Boundaries that are as or more accurate than Met Council orthophotos.
Tim Leach	Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	Year built by structure. Conversion of vacant to built land.
Brad Ellis	University of Minnesota	Number of employees. (put in parking lot) Common name of business.
Ned Phillips	Rice Creek Watershed District	Plat information torrens/abstract.
Michael Munson	Metropolitan Council	Reinvestments / redevelopment related to change in value.
Chad Martini	Mn/DOT	Pass.
Bart Richardson	MN DNR	Different fields for owner and taxpayer.
Jim Von Haden	National Park Service	When parcel created. Land use over time. Difference between parcel created and building built.
Jason Podany	Metro Transit	Building footprints – (bike and walking paths – easements)
Dick Carlstrom	TIES	Age of residents (parking lot)
John Carpenter	Excensus, LLC	Subdivision / development names. Vacancies - built property
Jim Von Haden	National Park Service	Impervious versus pervious area.
Mark Kotz	Metropolitan Council	Multiple tax parcels within a parcel (condos) Parcel points.

RESULTS

The following table provides a list of the parcel-based information needs expressed by participants of the September 25, 2003 Regional Parcel Data Users Forum. Needs are listed in order of priority (based on number of votes).

Note that several organizations that were unable to attend the forum asked if they could provide input afterward. They were given the draft results and asked to add any additional needs and vote for up to 5 needs, just like the forum participants. These post-forum participants were:

- City of Roseville – David Windle
- North Metro I-35W Corridor Coalition (7 cities); the Northwest Corridor Partnership (5 cities); the Fridley/Columbia Heights Joint Planning Project (3 cities) – as one voting unit represented by John Carpenter, Excensus
- St. Paul, Spring Lake Park and Roseville School Districts – as one voting unit represented by John Carpenter, Excensus
- Land Management Information Center – Susanne Maeder

The Metropolitan Council also provided some additional needs after the forum, but no additional votes.

Asterisks (*) indicate where participants designated a need as critical to their business. (For example, the three asterisks in the “Number of residential units” row indicate that two local government participants and one regional government participant said that this was a critical need.)

Parcel and Property Need (Desired Parcel Dataset Enhancement)	Prioritization Votes			
	Total	Local Govt.	Regional Govt.	State, Fed Academic
Residential structure characteristics (e.g. square footage; # bedrooms; dwelling types (single family detached, duplex, townhomes); home style (rambler, split entry, cape cod); garage; basement; heating/cooling)	8	4	2	2
Names of all owners , including first and last name in separate fields.	7	2	1 *	4 *
Addresses for all units on parcel (e.g. all apartments or stores in a strip mall, or buildings on a corporate campus)	6	3	2	1
All tax parcels in the polygon (information needed for condos, etc. e.g. parcel points)	6	4	2	
Number of residential units	5	3 **	2 *	
Parcel boundaries align to orthophotos/improved positional accuracy (desire is to have parcel boundaries at least as accurate at the Met. Council orthophotos.)	5	1	3	1
Type of use (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial; single family vs. multi family; multiple uses)	4	1	1 *	2
Attribute consistency (owners, addresses)	4	3 *		1
Year structure built (original structure)	3	1	1	1
Address of parcel – both situs and mailing address (issue with city field)	3		3	
Owner mailing address	3		1	2
Public land ownership (type of owner, agency name, tax exemption)	3		1	2 *
Easements (e.g. utilities, drainage)	3	1	1	1
Name of development in which parcel resides (e.g. “Whispering Pines”)	3	3		

Business common name (e.g. McDonalds, Kohls)	2		1	1
Legal description (e.g. plat, lot & block, metes and bounds)	2	1	1	
Path or trail locations (e.g. bike paths)	2		1	1
Where is new development (e.g. subdivisions)	2	1	1	
Parcel Size (parcel polygon acreage is OK)	2		1	1
Conservation easements	2			2
Year of last sale or change of ownership (e.g. issues with sales to relatives for \$1 may not be included in last sale, but is still a change in ownership)	1		1	
Historical archives (e.g. land use, value, number of units)	1			1
Right-of-way and easement dimensions	1		1	
Building permits on parcel	1	1		
Well and septic on parcel	1			1
Improved topology (eliminate unclosed polygons when converting to coverage format)	1			1
Unoccupied built properties	0			
Torrens vs. abstract property	0			
Reinvestment/redevelopment	0			
Street access to parcel	0			
Leases on parcel	0			
Need find the location of a given address	0			
Need to find an address for a given location	0			
Pre-defined custom polygon clip	0			
School district	0			
Geography for all area in the county (e.g. want polygons for lakes and rights-of-way)	0			
Owner phone number	0			
Building to land value ratio	0			
Owner occupied vs. rental designation	0			
Homestead status (complete status, not just yes or no)	0			
Height of structure on parcel and number of stories	0			
Number of parking spaces	0			
Zoning	0			
Rental fee per unit	0			
City water and sewer availability on parcel	0			
Taxpayer name, address and tax ID number	0			
Tax exempt status, including why it is tax exempt	0			
Special assessments	0			
Tax forfeiture status	0			
TIF status	0			
Agricultural info (e.g. Agricultural Preserves status (certified or enrolled) and expiration; Green acres; Tillable acreage)	0			
Historic site status	0			
Brownfields	0			
Last document of record for the parcel	0			
Development restrictions (e.g. covenants, land trusts, etc.)	0			
Conditional use permit	0			

Parking Lot Information Needs

Need	Comments
Number of residents	Being addressed by the socioeconomic needs workgroup
Age of residents	Being addressed by the socioeconomic needs workgroup
Number of employees	Being addressed by the socioeconomic needs workgroup
Trails	Separate layer
Impervious surfaces	Separate layer
Building footprints	Separate layer

WRAP-UP AND NEXT STEPS

Mark Kotz thanked the participants for their participation, encouraged them to complete an evaluation form, which included a place to volunteer for subsequent workgroup activity, and noted that the next steps would be as follows:

1. The MetroGIS Parcel Data workgroup will review the needs and priorities and translate into specifications for potential enhancements to the dataset.
2. The workgroup will also attempt to define the resources necessary to make the desired enhancements.
3. Other stakeholders (e.g. assessors) will be invited to provide feedback on the feasibility of the enhancements.
4. The workgroup will then make recommendations for achieving enhancements, including identifying any issues surrounding standardization of the data.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Results

MetroGIS Regional Parcel Data Users Forum

Excellent	(4)
Good	(3)
Average	(2)
Needs Improvement	(1)

Note: Not all participants turned in an evaluation form.

1. Pre-session contact and information	3.33
2. Explanation of Forum objectives	3.50
3. Preparation handouts	3.33
4. Explanation of parcel dataset history and background	3.50
5. Needs/enhancements "roundtable" exercise	3.42
6. Did the organization team provide the necessary next steps?	3.50
7. Organization Team's.....	
a) Ability to encourage diverse viewpoints	3.58
b) Ability to obtain consensus	3.25
c) Ability to manage time	3.42
d) Ability to address your needs and goals	3.33
8. Adequacy of facilities	3.42
9. Usefulness of this Data Users Forum	3.42

Additional Comments:

- Outstanding!
- Good job - [I] hope results are achieved.
- Good collection of people.
- Need coffee.
- Good way to manage a very diverse group's needs.
- Thanks!
- I suggest a one-day GIS user conference for GIS users in the Metro Area.

Table of all evaluation responses

Organization Team's...														
Question:	Pre-session contact and information	Explanation of Forum objectives	Preparation handouts	Explanation of parcel dataset history and background	Needs/enhancements "roundtable" exercise	Did the organization team provide the necessary next steps?	...Ability to encourage diverse viewpoints	...Ability to obtain consensus	...Ability to manage time	...Ability to address your goals and needs	Adequacy of facilities	Usefulness of Data Users Forum	Ave per participant	
Participant													Ave per participant	Median
1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4.00	4.00
2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	3	3	3	3.00	3.00
3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00	4.00
4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.17	3.00
5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	3.00
6	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4.00	4.00
7	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3.00	3.00
8	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3.33	3.00
9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3.00	3.00
10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	3.00
11	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3.67	4.00
12	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4.00	4.00
Ave per question	3.33	3.50	3.33	3.50	3.42	3.50	3.58	3.25	3.42	3.33	3.42	3.42		
Median	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.00		

APPENDIX B
Forum Invitation Letter

MetroGIS

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data



August 20, 2003

Dear Licensees of the MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset:

You are invited and encouraged to attend a forum that will be hosted by MetroGIS for users of its endorsed regional parcel dataset. The purpose of the forum will be to define potential enhancements to this valuable parcel dataset that will help meet your organization's business needs. Thus, your input is of fundamental importance.

The forum will be held from 1 to 4 p.m. on **Thursday, September 25, 2003** at the John Rose Skating Facility, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville. Our goal is to get participation from 30 or more of the organizations that use the regional parcel dataset and who also represent the diverse interests that comprise the MetroGIS community.

The current version of the regional dataset has been available for more than a year. We want to hear what you think about it and how it could be improved to better meet your business needs. MetroGIS is committed to continually assessing user satisfaction with endorsed regional datasets and related policies and procedures. As users of this critical dataset, we trust that you will take us up on this opportunity to define desired enhancements for the next-generation product.

We are asking an appropriate representative from your organization to attend the forum. This should be someone who has some familiarity with the regional parcel dataset as well as with your organization's business needs related to parcels and property information. Please RSVP (*see below*) to ensure that we are adequately set up for the forum. An information packet will be sent to each attendee the week prior to the forum to stimulate identification of desired enhancements, including the method of distribution via MetroGIS DataFinder Café. For those of you who have not attended a MetroGIS Data Users Forum in the past, the design encourages an interactive discussion among the participants. A prioritization exercise will conclude the forum to give MetroGIS direction concerning next steps.

If you have any questions, please contact Mark Kotz at mark.kotz@metc.state.mn.us. Mark is the GIS Database Administrator for the Metropolitan Council and serves as the lead staff for the regional parcel dataset. He will be facilitating the forum.

To **RSVP**, please email Steve Fester at steve.fester@metc.state.mn.us or call him at 651-602-1363 on or before **Friday, September 19**.

I hope you will plan to attend this important event.

Sincerely,

Victoria Reinhardt, Chair
MetroGIS Policy Board *and*
Ramsey County Commissioner

cc: Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator
Mark Kotz, Project Manager, Regional Parcel Dataset