

## EGC Parcel Workgroup Meeting

1/21/14

### VTrans Board Room

**Present:** Johnathan Croft, VTrans; Gary Smith, VTrans; Leslie Pelch, VCGI; Ivan Brown, VCGI; Jack O'Wril, FPR; Dan Currier, CVRPC; John Adams, ACCD; Todd LeBlanc, VALA; Scott Manley, City of S. Burlington.

Johnathan provided us with the list of questions we had started brainstorming about at the January 7 meeting (all in reference to the imagined statewide parcel data maintenance program of the future):

1. Who will do the work?
2. Who owns the data?
3. Who will fund the work?
4. How often is the data updated?
5. What products get created?
6. What standard is used, and how extensive?
7. Who owns the program?
8. Who are the constituents?

We continued our discussion related to the **Funding (3)** question.

Leslie was reminded that she needs to contact the ANR Wastewater regulation folks to gain a better understanding of that permit program and whether it provides an avenue for the flow of parcel boundary changes into a state system.

We discussed recording fees again and the fact that every subdivision does require the creation or amendment of a deed, and therefore does require a recording fee. Todd later looked up the statute on reappraisal fees and found the following:

#### § 4041a. Reappraisal

(a) A municipality shall be paid \$8.50 per grand list parcel per year, from the equalization and reappraisal account within the education fund to be used only for reappraisal and costs related to reappraisal of its grand list properties and for maintenance of the grand list. Additionally, a municipality shall be paid \$3.65 per grand list parcel for the first 100 parcels \$0.20 for each of the next 100 parcels, and \$0.01 for each parcel in excess of 200 from the equalization and reappraisal account within the education fund, to be used only for costs to acquire assessment education provided under section 3436 of this title.

We then got into a bit of a discussion about the idea of raising revenue by charging fees to access data. John pointed out that Maryland does it, Ivan shared that Fairfax county, VA does it. We talked about the fact that VT has historically had a strong Public records law that prevents public entities from charging much more than the cost of reproduction and time spent (if more than 30 minutes). But the law could be changed...

We then switched to a discussion of the **Frequency of Updates (4)**.

Everyone agreed that continual updating is the goal, but that annual update (or access to updates annually) would be acceptable.

We should research how often e911 is actually updated, in relation to what is posted on their web site. Also, what is frequency of update to the grand list/property transfer data?

Next, we tackled what exactly the **Data Products (5)** of this statewide parcel data maintenance program will be.

- One statewide shapefile
- Individual shapefiles for towns
- An online map viewer? (what functionality?)
- Paper Maps?

What about the data format? Just shapefile?

- Shapefile – need to distribute in this format for the foreseeable future
- Geodatabase – this should probably be format data is actually managed in if the state is owner of the data
- Cadastral Fabric? – might be too early for this, but eventually (Ryan Cloutier and Scott Manley are our official go-to people on this topic)

What **Data Standard (6)** should be used to provide technical specifications?

Dan suggested that we use the existing Level One GIS Parcel Data Standard (published by VCGI) with a few things added on to it:

Multipart polygons to account for polygons split by rights of way, include hooks

Right of Way polygons – at least those that VTrans has available for inclusion. Perhaps only those that reflect owned in fee? We need to tackle issue of where parcel boundaries end. Road right of ways do not indicate ownership if they extend X number of feet off the edge of the road, do they? This is not represented consistently across the state. We need a consistent rule.

Bodies of Water – already included in standard, but we may need to refine/define better.

Seamless???? – meaning no gaps/overlaps between towns.

A new Technical Advisory Committee (to VCGI) should be convened to deal with a re-write of the existing standard, but we should not hold up the statewide maintenance program effort while waiting for that committee to finish its tasks.

Finally, we discussed who will **Own the Program (7)**?

Gary Smith had circulated his thoughts on a possible partnership scenario between the Tax Dept. and VCGI. Since The Tax Dept. already owns the assessment data (containing the SPAN) and VCGI has the appropriate skill set for managing the geospatial aspect of the data and updates.

Another scenario would be the State supporting the RPCs to oversee parcel data update and compilation for their region. Any towns that couldn't deal with mapping contractor could just hand over that aspect of things to the RPC.

We ran out of time to finish this particular discussion. So we talked about the legislative aspect of this effort briefly.

Someone suggested that Bob Krebs might be a legislator interested in this issue (he is a surveyor from South Hero). Committees of importance were identified: Gov. Ops, Institutions, Appropriations.