

# MetroGIS Regional Parcel Dataset Enhancement Recommendations

## Long Version – March 4, 2004

This “Long Version” of the recommendations of the Parcel Workgroup includes all desired enhancements identified through the Sept. 2003 Parcel Data Review Forum in order of priority rank. The table includes even those desired enhancements that the Parcel Workgroup is not recommending. Comments and related information are provided in this long version. A short version of these recommendations is also available.

### Background:

1. Review Forum was held on Sept. 25<sup>th</sup>, 2003
2. After the forum, a workgroup formed with these active members and/or reviewers:
  - Anoka County = Gary Swenson
  - Carver County = Gordon Chinander
  - Dakota County = Kent Tupper
  - Hennepin County = Bob Moulder
  - Ramsey County = Curt Peterson
  - Scott County = Dan Pfeffer
  - Washington County = Dave Brandt
  - Mosquito Control = Nancy Read
  - Metro 911 Board = Pete Eggimann
  - Representing cities and school districts = John Carpenter, Excensus
  - Workgroup staff = Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
3. The workgroup met twice on Nov. 17<sup>th</sup> and Dec. 12<sup>th</sup> 2003.
4. Continued review of the recommendations occurred by e-mail.
5. Nine of the ten workgroup members/reviewers approved the final recommendations. One member/reviewer did not respond with a specific approval or disapproval.

**These recommendations would require counties to provide the Regional Parcel Dataset in a specified format with specific field names, types, lengths and order. These recommendations do not require counties to populate all fields in the dataset. It is understood that counties may not be able to populate all fields in the dataset due to data availability and other issues. This is consistent with the existing roles and responsibilities of the Regional Parcel Dataset.**

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
<b>1a</b>	<b>Square footage</b>	8	<b>Include a field for finished square footage</b> FIN_SQ_FT - numeric 11	In general counties seem to have this. Many have both finished area square footage and foundation square footage. We will just use the former.

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
<b>1b</b>	<b># bedrooms</b>	“	<b>Include a field for number of bedrooms</b> BEDROOMS - numeric 2	This is likely available from the CAMA data in all counties.
<b>1c</b>	<b>Dwelling type</b> (single family, duplex, etc.) See also #7	“	<b>Include a dwelling type field</b> DWELL_TYPE - text 30	So far, I've only found that Dakota has a field specific to this. Maybe other counties do, but not in standard extract? Otherwise much of this information is generally in the assessor's land use type information. Counties can provide it as available.
<b>1d</b>	<b>Home style</b> (rambler, split entry)	“	<b>Include a home style field that will replace the existing “Type of Structure” field.</b> HOME_STYLE - text 30	Most (possibly all) counties have a field devoted specifically to this.
<b>1e</b>	<b>Garage</b>	“	<b>Include a garage Y/N field and a garage square footage field.</b>  GARAGE - text 1 GARAGESQFT - numeric 11	All seven counties reporting have garage square footage data, although there are issues with accessibility and quality of the data.
<b>1f</b>	<b>Basement</b>	“	<b>Include a basement Y/N field</b>  BASEMENT - text 1	Six of seven counties report having some information about the existence of basements. Issues exist with completeness, accessibility and quality in many counties.
<b>1g</b>	<b>Heating/cooling</b>	“	<b>Include heating and cooling type fields.</b>  HEATING - TEXT 30 COOLING - TEXT 30	Six of seven counties report having some information about heating and cooling types. Issues exist with completeness, accessibility and quality in many counties.
<b>2</b>	<b>Names of all owners</b> , including first and last name in separate fields.	7**	<b>Include field for additional owner name information and specify last-name-first format if available.</b>  OWNER_NAME - text 50 OWNER_MORE - text 50  <b>Owner name should be last-name-first if available. If additional info is available (e.g. joint owner, or first-name-first), put that in the OWNER_MORE field. Document what OWNER_MORE is used for with each county.</b>	Only two counties report having separate name field for two owners and only one of these reports having separate first and last name fields.
<b>3</b>	<b>Addresses for all units on parcel</b> (e.g. all apartments or stores in a strip mall, or buildings on a corporate campus)	6	<b>Move this need to the MetroGIS Address Workgroup in 2004.</b>	While important, this is not parcel data and will not be part of the regional parcel dataset.

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
4	<b>All tax parcels in the polygon</b> (information needed for condos, etc. e.g. parcel points)	6	<b>Each county should have a points layer with all tax parcels for the county (includes condos). It does not need to include mobile homes and individual apartment units which are not “real” property. This layer should include all records, not just condos. There should be one point for each record, even if the points stack on top of each other. These seven layers should be appended to one combined dataset for MetroGIS distribution.</b>	All counties are already providing this information in the regional parcel dataset in some fashion except Washington, which could provide it too. Methods for doing this differ though (points, stacked polygons, cut-up polygons).  This will require additional data processing for the 5 counties that do not already provide this data. This could be done outside of the county from the provided datasets for all counties except Washington and possibly Scott (depending on how they choose to handle condos).
5	<b>Number of residential units</b>	5***	<b>Populate the existing regional dataset with this data where it is available.</b>	The existing regional dataset has this data in Ramsey and Dakota, and for some parcels in Anoka. Several other counties have said that they do maintain it in some format in the county.
6	<b>Parcel boundaries align to orthophotos/improved positional accuracy</b> (desire is to have parcel boundaries at least as accurate as the Met. Council orthophotos.)	5	<b>Do nothing.</b>	This is being worked on in Anoka Co. There is nothing the workgroup can to do.
7	<b>Type of use</b> (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial; single family vs. multi family; multiple uses)  See also #s 1c, 40 & 47	4*	<b>Include the fields for the descriptions of up to four uses and a multiple use flag field.</b>  USE1_DESC - text 100 USE2_DESC - text 100 USE3_DESC - text 100 USE4_DESC - text 100  MULTI_USES - text 1	All counties have some type of data like this. It seems to be collected and stored differently in each county.  All counties seem to have a code and a description for use. Some counties have up to four use type codes. Four counties have a multiple use flag, one does not. Two counties might be able to derive it from other data with some work.  Some use type related information can often be found in other fields too, specifically the tax exempt status field and sometimes the homestead status field.
8	<b>Attribute consistency</b> (owners, addresses) This item relates to having the same structure of owner name (or taxpayer name) and address information across counties.	4*	<b>Review any recommendations provided in the future by the MetroGIS Address Workgroup.</b>	Changing owner name field (# 2) will resolve much of this. The workgroup did not feel it was desirable to break out the taxpayer name into multiple fields nor was is it desirable to break the owner or taxpayer addresses into multiple fields like is done for the parcel address. Counties do not generally have the owner or taxpayer address as multiple fields anyway.
9	<b>Year structure built</b> (original structure)	3	<b>Provided clearer documentation in existing dataset.</b>	This data is currently provided for all counties.

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
10	Address of parcel – both situs and mailing address (issue with city field)	3	<p><b>Get a review of this recommendation from the MetroGIS Address Workgroup prior to finalizing</b></p> <p><b>Create two fields for the parcel city.</b>  <b>CITY = the geographic city</b>  <b>CITY_USPS = the USPS mailing city</b></p> <p><b>Breakdown the current STREET field further into name, type, direction, etc. If a county cannot provide individual components, just fill in the STREETNAME field with combined components as is done with the STREET field in the current dataset, and document in the metadata.</b></p> <p>BLDG_NUM - text 10  PREFIX_DIR - text 2  PREFIXTYPE - text 6  STREETNAME - text 40  STREETTYPE - text 4  SUFFIX_DIR - text 2  UNIT_INFO - text 12  CITY - text 20  CITY_USPS - text 20  ZIP - text 5  ZIP4 - text 4</p>	<p>This data is provided by all counties, but some provide a mailing city and some the actual city.</p> <p>Most counties have the property address broken down into all possible address components e.g. street name, type, direction, etc.</p>
11	Owner mailing address	3	<b>Do nothing</b>	This field exists in the dataset and is provided by all counties except Hennepin. See #8 for consistency issues.
12	Public land ownership (type of owner (e.g. state vs. fed), agency name, tax exemption)	3*	<b>Provide exempt use information (see #47)</b>	There is really no clear way to get at this apart from what is already provided for owner name. The only other potential source of information is the exempt use code.
13	Easements (e.g. utilities, drainage)	3	<b>Do nothing</b>	Few counties have any good right-of-way or easement geography in digital form other than what is in the existing parcel dataset. Where it does exist, it covers only a small percentage of easements. Some would have it in scanned plat information. Counties do not generally have easement attribute data tied to parcels?
23	Right-of-way and easement dimensions	1		

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
14	<b>Name of development</b> in which parcel resides (e.g. "Whispering Pines") <b>Plat name</b> Also see #16	3	<b>Provide plat name. See #16.</b>	This would only exist in the plat information. Most counties have a field specifically for plat name, or abbreviate plat name. Some only have this information in the legal description field.
15	<b>Landmark/Business common name</b> (e.g. McDonalds, Lake Jr. High School, Elm Park)	2	<b>Include this field in the regional dataset and pursue the idea of having data users provide data and updates to producers to populate this field.</b>  LANDMARK - text 100	Only Dakota seems to currently have this information. Although this data currently exists in only one county, an opportunity exists to have users of the regional dataset contribute this data.
16	<b>Legal description</b> (e.g. plat, lot & block, metes and bounds) Also see #14	2	<b>Where available, provide plat name, block and lot.</b>  PLAT_NAME - text 50 BLOCK - text 5 LOT - text 5	All counties have several fields relating to legal description. Generally they have plat, lot and block as well as one or more fields related to an abbreviate legal description. Because the legal description is abbreviated in some counties and extremely lengthy data in counties where it is not abbreviated, it was decided that the legal description should not be included in the regional dataset. Counties did not feel it would be useful or appropriate to provide a partial legal description.
17	<b>Path or trail locations</b> (e.g. bike paths)	2	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is not parcel data, except to the extent that it would be part of an easement or right-of-way (see #s 13 & 23 above)
18	<b>Where is new development</b> (e.g. subdivisions)	2	<b>Do nothing</b>	The only way to get at this would be from the existing YEAR_BUILT field (#9), or to look at change in the polygons from one time period to the next (# 22), or through building permits (#24).
19	<b>Parcel Size</b> (parcel polygon acreage is OK)	2	<b>Create fields for both polygon and deeded acres.</b>  ACRES_POLY - numeric 11 ACRES_DEED - numeric 11	All counties have an acres type field in their data. Some have multiple fields. Some have deeded acres and some have polygon acres or both.
20	<b>Conservation easements</b>	2	<b>Do nothing</b>	Not available tied to county parcel data.
21	<b>Year of last sale</b> 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	<b>Clearly documented issues with field in existing dataset.</b>	According to most counties, in general this includes all "arm's length" transactions and would not, for example, include a sale to a family member for \$1. This may vary by county.
22	<b>Historical archives</b> (e.g. land use, value, number of units)	1	<b>Do nothing. If demand for historic datasets arises, make them available.</b>	Historical datasets are backed up by the Council, but are not available online. Should an annual version be made available online? Maybe wait for a demand for it?

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
23	<i>Moved to 13</i>			
24	<b>Building permits</b> on parcel	1	<b>Do nothing</b>	Four counties report having building permit information somewhere in the county databases. The type of information differs between counties. It seems to be updated annually in those counties. It is not part of their standard extract. Since it is not widely available and is a low priority (only one vote), we will not include in the regional dataset.
25	<b>Well and septic</b> on parcel	1	<b>Do nothing</b>	Counties do not collect this data.
26	<b>Improved topology</b> (eliminate unclosed polygons when converting to coverage format)	1	<b>Encourage users to report such issues directly to county.</b>	This is a data conversion issue, since many/most counties start with coverages anyway.
27	<b>Unoccupied built properties</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
28	<b>Torrens vs. abstract</b> property	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available tied to parcels
29	Reinvestment/redevelopment	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is really an analysis of data, not a specific attribute.
30	Street access to parcel	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This will involve an analysis of physical features data or orthophotography. It is not part of the parcel data or attributes.
31	<b>Leases</b> on parcel	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
32	Need find the location of a given address	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is an application of the data. See #10 for work on improving parcel address data.
33	Need to find an address for a given location	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is an application of the data. See #10 for work on improving parcel address data, and see #3 for non-parcel addresses.
34	Pre-defined custom polygon clip	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is a DataFinder Café issue, not a parcel data issue. DataFinder already allows a clip by existing geography (e.g. county or city boundary) or by drawing a custom polygon.
35	School district	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This information is already in the existing dataset and a school districts dataset exists on DataFinder that was created from the parcel data.
36	<b>Geography for all area</b> in the county (e.g. want polygons for lakes and rights-of-way)	0	<b>Ask counties to provide what geography they can.</b>	This can actually be a significant issue for some kinds of applications and analysis dealing with rights-of-way (see also #13 and 23).
37	Owner phone number	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This does not exist in the parcel attributes at the counties. Hopefully improvements to owner name (# 2) will aid the lookup of phone numbers in the white pages.
38	Building to land value ratio	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	This is a simple calculation that could be done by anyone. However, there is not enough demand for this to justify including it as a separate attribute in the regional dataset.

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
39	Owner occupied vs. rental designation	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	The homestead status information (already in the parcel dataset, and see # 40) is the only information in the parcel dataset that would get at owner occupancy. The use type information (# 7) and number of units (# 5) will be the only indications of apartment status.
40	<b>Homestead status</b> (complete status, not just yes or no)	0	<b>Keep the existing HOMESTEAD Y/N field and add a “P” value to denote partial homesteads where that data is available.</b>	This information is available in all counties, however it is not uniformly encoded. Counties are not eager to provide information about disability status.
41	<b>Height of structure</b> on parcel and number of stories	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available.
42	Number of <b>parking spaces</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available.
43	<b>Zoning</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available.
44	Rental fee per unit	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available.
45	<b>City water and sewer availability</b> on parcel	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Counties do not collect this data.
46	<b>Taxpayer name, address and tax ID number</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Name and address are already in the parcel dataset. Tax ID numbers are not available.
47	<b>Tax exempt status</b> , including why it is tax exempt	0	<b>Keep existing TAX_EXEMPT Y/N field and allow up to four exempt use descriptions.</b>  XUSE1_DESC - text 100 XUSE2_DESC - text 100 XUSE3_DESC - text 100 XUSE4_DESC - text 100	Most counties populate the Y/N field in the existing dataset.  Most counties also have additional exempt use description information in their standard extract, with some counties having fields for multiple exempt uses.  Exempt use is useful for use type (#7) indications sometimes too, as well as potential use for public ownership indication (#12).
48	<b>Special assessments</b>	0	<b>Add one field with special assessment value due and payable in current year.</b>  SPEC_ASSES - numeric 11	Nearly all counties have a special assessments value/amount field in their standard extract.
49	<b>Tax forfeiture status</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	The consensus is that this information is complicated and the limited demand does not justify the work to include in regional dataset.  Looking at standard extracts, two counties have a Y/N type field for tax forfeiture status. Two other counties have information about forfeitures in the land use type code.

	<i>Potential Enhancement from Review Forum</i>	<i>Votes</i>	<i>Workgroup Recommendations</i>	<i>Comments &amp; Research Notes</i>
50	<b>TIF status</b> , including end date	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	<p>The consensus is that this information is complicated and the limited demand does not justify the work to include in regional dataset.</p> <p>Nearly all counties have a TIF district number in their standard extracts. One has a start date, but none had an end date.</p>
51	<b>Agricultural info</b> (e.g. Agricultural Preserves status (certified or enrolled) and expiration; Green acres; Tillable acreage)	0	<p><b>Add Y/N fields for ag. preserves, green acres and open space and dates for ag. preserves.</b></p> <p>GREEN_ACRE - text 1            OPEN_SPACE - text 1            AG_PRESERV - text 1            AGPRE_ENRD - Enrolled date (date field)            AGPRE_EXPD - Expiration date (date field)</p>	<p>In standard extracts, 5 counties have some kind of ag preserves indicator, 3 have green acres indicator, 2 have open space indicator and one shows tillable acres.</p> <p>Additionally, Met Council has collected ag preserves data from each county (except Ramsey which has no ag. preserves). Total of 2781 records. All counties have enrolled parcels and expiration date, four have enrolled date. Format for data from counties included shape file, spreadsheets and a Word file.</p> <p>One option for the ag. preserves data is that it could be populated in the regional dataset by the Met. Council based on data it collects from the county on an annual basis. Clearer documentation would have to be found for data from some counties. However, it might be more efficient overall to populate these fields directly in the county. This may vary by county.</p>
52	<b>Historic site status</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
53	<b>Brownfields</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
54	<b>Last document of record</b> for the parcel	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
55	Development restrictions (e.g. covenants, land trusts, etc.)	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available
56	<b>Conditional use permit</b>	0	<b>Do nothing</b>	Data not available

## Full Needs/Enhancement List from Forum

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).

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
<b>Residential structure characteristics</b> (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
<b>Names of all owners</b> , including first and last name in separate fields.	7	2	1 *	4 *
<b>Addresses for all units on parcel</b> (e.g. all apartments or stores in a strip mall, or buildings on a corporate campus)	6	3	2	1
<b>All tax parcels in the polygon</b> (information needed for condos, etc. e.g. parcel points)	6	4	2	
<b>Number of residential units</b>	5	3 **	2 *	
<b>Parcel boundaries align to orthophotos/improved positional accuracy</b> (desire is to have parcel boundaries at least as accurate at the Met. Council orthophotos.)	5	1	3	1
<b>Type of use</b> (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial; single family vs. multi family; multiple uses)	4	1	1 *	2
<b>Attribute consistency</b> (owners, addresses)	4	3 *		1
<b>Year structure built</b> (original structure)	3	1	1	1
<b>Address of parcel</b> – both situs and mailing address (issue with city field)	3		3	
<b>Owner mailing address</b>	3		1	2
<b>Public land ownership</b> (type of owner, agency name, tax exemption)	3		1	2 *
<b>Easements</b> (e.g. utilities, drainage)	3	1	1	1
<b>Name of development</b> in which parcel resides (e.g. “Whispering Pines”)	3	3		
<b>Business common name</b> (e.g. McDonalds, Kohls)	2		1	1
<b>Legal description</b> (e.g. plat, lot & block, metes and bounds)	2	1	1	
<b>Path or trail locations</b> (e.g. bike paths)	2		1	1
<b>Where is new development</b> (e.g. subdivisions)	2	1	1	
<b>Parcel Size</b> (parcel polygon acreage is OK)	2		1	1
<b>Conservation easements</b>	2			2
<b>Year of last sale</b> 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	
<b>Historical archives</b> (e.g. land use, value, number of units)	1			1
<b>Right-of-way and easement dimensions</b>	1		1	

<b>Building permits on parcel</b>	1	1		
<b>Well and septic on parcel</b>	1			1
<b>Improved topology</b> (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			