

California GIS Council
Digital Land Records Information Workshop
USGS, Sacramento, CA
October 19, 2005

Welcome and introduction by Oscar Jarquin. There were 52 attendees representing:

Local Government

Calaveras County
City of Modesto
City of Redding
City of Woodland
Contra Costa County
El Dorado County
Madera County Assessor
Orange County Assessor
Placer County Assessor
Sacramento County
San Mateo County Assessor
Santa Clara County
Sonoma County
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Southern California Association of Governments

Private Sector

CD-Data, Inc
ESRI
Farallon Geographics, Inc.
GEODAC Corporation
Intergraph
Michael Baker Corporation
Psomas
Tele Atlas
Vestra Resources Inc.

State Government

California Board of Equalization
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Forestry
California Department of Water Resources
California Geographic Information Association
California Office of Emergency Services
California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
California Resources Agency
California Department of Transportation
Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Federal Government

National Geodetic Survey
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Department of Agriculture -NRCS
U.S. Department of Interior / Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Geological Survey

Introduction - Craig Gooch, Psomas, provided introduction to creating a statewide digital parcel database. The introduction was followed by four 10-minute presentations to provide background.

DLRI Infrastructure and Standards - Dennis Wuthrich, Farallon Geographics, presented information of potential infrastructure and standards of a statewide database.

Benefits of DLRI - Bruce Joffe, GIS Consultants, did a presentation on the benefits of a statewide DLRI.

State of Various Parcel Databases - Malcolm Adkins, Michael Baker Corp, presented on the states of parcel information in various counties in California.

Financial Implications - Craig Gooch, followed with a presentation on the financial implications.

Open Discussion – After the presentations, Oscar Jarquin moderated an open discussion that lasted about an hour and a half. The primary objective of the discussion was to start communication with local government to identify challenges and opportunities in developing a statewide database of parcel information.

Oscar Jarquin describing the intent of the Digital Land Record Information (DLRI) Workgroup started the discussion.

The following are issues that were presented during the discussion. They will serve to draft a recommendation to the California GIS Council on how to proceed to develop a statewide parcel database.

- Change laws to ease implementation
- Data cost, accessibility, standards, maintenance, privacy
- Identify enforcement problems
- Assessors are meeting re: AG's opinion
- Information sharing issues

- What would counties like to see from the state?
 - Counties are struggling with “do more with less”. Limited by funds and legal mandate.
- Contra Costa Co: data should be free, but reality interferes
 - There needs to be give and take between levels of government
- Some counties are able to freely/cheaply provide parcel datasets
- Need statewide data standard
- Attorney General did not specify the format in which data must be available
- Cost of reproduction
 - Media cost
 - Labor cost
- Should this group form one opinion to present to lawmakers?
- PTAF funds (818)
- Need guaranteed revenue source for county assessors
- Data security (including *physical* security, e.g. flood damage of records)
- Data prices too high?
- Pass-through funding vs. guaranteed funding for counties
- State as customer?
- Value of backlog roll
 - ~10%
 - Supplemental roll (backlog of updates and assessment roll) growing
- County responsible for updating, need help from state with funds
- Revenue generation through local investment
- Need efficient sharing scheme
- Attorney General opinion driven by private sector
- Why should a *public* agency have to pay for *public* data?
- All parties should help address the concerns of the county assessors
- Workshop Purpose
 - Inform CA GIS Council of needs
 - To be inclusive
- Information Needs
 - Parcel data (access to it)
 - Opportunity to give input
- Madera County attended FEMA training. Valuable experience.
- Main recommendation to Governor
- State should empower local government
- Pool resources between levels of government
- Recognize that disasters do not respect county boundaries
- Collaborative data collection saves funds.

Potential Solutions – After the open discussion, Bruce Joffe presented potential solutions. The most discussed solution is the taxing of every real estate

transaction of one dollar to generate guaranteed funding for the counties and/or cities that maintain parcel information.

Next Steps – The next step is for the DLRI workgroup to draft a recommendation to the California GIS Council on how to proceed with developing a statewide parcel database. The recommendation will be circulated to the participants of the DLRI workshop and other interested parties for comments and input.

Adjournment – Meeting adjourned.