		ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
F	PARCEL FEATURE CLASS	
	ARCELID	
	AXPARCELID	
	ARCELDATE AXROLLYEAR	
	WNERNME1	
	WNERNME2	
<b>✓</b> P:	STLADRESS	
✓ SI	TEADRESS	
*	ADDNUMPREFIX	<ul> <li>ADDNUMPREFIX: Approximately 5,970 records with values of 'COUNTY ROAD,' 'E,' 'S,' 'W,' et cetera. Based on the SITEADRESS and PREFIX values, these are PREFIX values. Remove these values from the ADDNUMPREFIX field.</li> <li>Approximately 28 records missing ADDNUMPREFIX values, but address number prefix values present in the SITEADRESS field (for SITEADRESS values of 'N2502 8TH AVENUE,' 'N2523 11TH AVENUE,' 'N2520 COUNTY ROAD E'). Ensure that all address element fields are populated accurately and as appropriate for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>√</b>	ADDNUM	ADDAHIMCHEEV A
*	ADDNUMSUFFIX	<ul> <li>ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 509 records missing ADDNUMSUFFIX values, but address number suffix values present in the SITEADRESS field (for SITEADRESS values of '965 A BUTTERCUP AVENUE,' '619 B S 20TH AVE'). Ensure that all address element fields are populated as appropriate for future data submissions</li> </ul>
*	PREFIX – with standardized domains	• PREFIX: See comment above in ADDNUMPREFIX.
<u> </u>	STREETNAME  CTREETTYPE with at an elevation of a practice.	
*	STREETTYPE – with standardized domains SUFFIX – with standardized domains	• <b>SUFFIX</b> : Approximately 2 records with SUFFIX values that were repeated in address number suffix and landmark name.
		Ensure that all address element fields are populated as appropriate for future data submissions.
<u> </u>	LANDMARKNAME UNITTYPE	
	UNITIPE	
▼ P	LACENAME	
<b>✓</b> Z	PCODE	
<b>√</b> Z	P4	
	ГАТЕ	
	CHOOLDIST – with standardized domains CHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
- 100	NTASSDVALUE	• CNTASSDVALUE: Approximately 9 records where CNTASSDVALUE was not equal to LNDVALUE + IMPVALUE, because either the
		CNTASSDVALUE field was missing a value, or an issue with IMPVALUE value. Please ensure accuracy of values in these fields.
	NDVALUE	
	IPVALUE  FLVALUE	
484	TFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~575 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ N	ETPRPTA	- Tax exempt (AUNCLASS X1-X4) > ~6 Tecords in the country's vo submittal
	RSPRPTA	
<b>*</b> P	ROPCLASS – with standardized domains	• <b>PROPCLASS</b> : In initial data submission, approximately 1,260 (3.3%) records missing values in PROPCLASS/AUXCLASS fields, which were notated as potentially taxable real estate (based on OWNERNME1 values and V5 submission). These particular records would be expected to have a value of "1" (residential) in PROPCLASS field. Thank you for your continued attention to such issues for future data submissions.
	UXCLASS – with standardized domains	
	SSDACRES EEDACRES	
	SACRES	
	<b>DNAME</b> – with standardized domains	
<b>✓</b> P.	ARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
	ARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
	Projection met statewide schema	
	County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)  Condo modeling met statewide schema	
	OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
	LSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
	OTHER LAYERS – RML	
	oning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK oning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	oning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	ther Layers – with standardized file names	
	SUBMISSION FREMAGE	
✓ P	ovided .ini submission form + data	
	MISCELLANEOUS	
•	Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's s Feedback on the annual parcel data submission proces Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission.	

09/15/f | Adams | Page 1 of 1

ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Man Datahase Pro	oject OBSERVATION REPORT Ashland County
issorr o statewide i arcer map batabase i re	•
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
PARCELID	
TAXPARCELID	<ul> <li>TAXPARCELID: Approximately 11 records erroneously had a value of '2020' in TAXPARCELID field instead of in the TAXROLLYEAR field where it belongs.</li> </ul>
PARCELDATE	• PARCELDATE: Approximately 1 record contained timestamp attached to the end of value. Remove timestamp from the end of this field for future data submissions.
TAXROLLYEAR	• TAXROLLYEAR: Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. As such, future tax roll year records should be <null> in all assessment/tax roll fields (i.e., CNTASSDVALUE, LNDVALUE, IMPVALUE, ESTFMKVALUE, NETPRPTA, GRSPRPTA, PROPCLASS, ASSDACRES). Null values for records with future tax roll years (~4,312 records; in ASSDACRES field).</null>
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
PSTLADRESS	
SITEADRESS	
ADDNUMPREFIX	
ADDNUM	
ADDNUMSUFFIX	
PREFIX – with standardized domains	
STREETNAME	
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE	
UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
LNDVALUE	
IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE	• <b>ESTFMKVALUE</b> : The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market
ESTFWKVALUE	value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~145 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~4 records in the county's V6 submittal
NETPRPTA	
GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES	
DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
—Projection met statewide schema	

- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS – PL

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

- ♦ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ♦ **Zoning**: **Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Barron County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains PREFIX: Approximately 5 records with a PREFIX value of 'E' present in the SITEADRESS field, but prefix was omitted from this individual element field (PREFIX) on submission. Ensure that all appropriate PREFIX values are included and present in individual address element field for future data submissions. **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID** PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓** DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema

- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **Zoning: Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA **FEATURE CLASS** PARCELID **TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** TAXROLLYEAR OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS: ~16 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'NO ST ADDRESS, DENMARK, WI 5420; 'NO ST ADDRESS, GREENLEAF, WI 54126'; 'NO ST ADDRESS.' Address values should not be incomplete. Clean records by entering a complete mailing address in PSTLADRESS, or enter <Null> for parcels without a complete address. STEADRESS: ~12,182 records with SITEADRESS like '100 S WISCONSIN ST BLK'; '1200 CYRUS DR BLK'; '0 SOUTHBRIDGE RD'; '0 BIRCH CREEK RD' et cetera. Determine if true ADDNUM value exists and populate as necessary, or set these to <Null> PSTLADRESS SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX** ADDNUM: ~81 records with values of '100-110,' '2074-2078,' '414-416,' '801-817,' et cetera. These appear to be address ranges. Keep primary address number and remove additional secondary values from the ADDNUM field, ensure accuracy of address numbers, and also ensure address number values are not a range. ~1 record with value of 'BACK.' <Null> out values which are not true address numbers. ~3 records with values containing extra characters: '-4801', '-1280', '-1281.' The extra dash characters should not exist in this field. Delete "-" from these records. ~2 records with an ADDNUM present in SITEADRESS field, but address number appears to be erroneously missing from individual ADDNUM field. Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated accurately and where appropriate. **ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: Approximately 69 records with a value of 'I 43.' Move PREFIX value into appropriate field and standardize domain. Approximately 9,404 records with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field ("N," "S," "E," "W," or "CTH"), but missing a corresponding value in the PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. STREETNAME: ~286 records with mistakenly spelled-out values of 'WEST' in the STREETNAME field and PREFIX values of 'CTH' (indicating county highways). For these records, correct STREETNAME values to reflect the true street name. Check your export routine for county highways named with alpha characters and ensure accuracy of STREETNAME values. ~69 records with erroneously spelled out values in the STREETNAME field, when compared to the SITEADRESS field. Correct the STREETNAME values so they match what is provided in the SITEADRESS field and are accurate. STREETTYPE: ~704 records with STREETTYPE values still attached, including 'ANGELS PATH,' 'CHAPELLE RUE,' 'FOREST GROVE,' 'FROBISHER FIELDS,' 'HERITAGE HEIGHTS,' and 'SPENCERS CROSSING.' Move STREETTYPE value to appropriate field and ensure all street type domains are spelled out. **PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains There are LANDMARKNAME errors on this report UNITTYPE which have reoccurred. The UNITID county will be asked to certify **✓ PLACENAME** that these issues will be rectified **✓** ZIPCODE prior to the next submission on ZIP4 the grant application. STATE If flagged errors are observed in ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains the future, the county's data ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains will not be assessed CNTASSDVALUE until it is free from LNDVALUE annually repeated **✓** IMPVALUE errors. MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~ 26 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~22 records in the county's V6 submittal **\*** ESTFMKVALUE ✓ NETPRPTA GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS - with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema THER LAYERS – PL ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RI Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county) **Zoning: Shoreland** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE **SUBMISSION PACKAGE**: The required .ini Submission Form was missing from the initial data submittal. It was provided upon follow-up request from DOA. Please verify that ALL information is complete and included before submitting. \* Provided .ini submission form + data MISCELLANEOUS

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- **PARCELID**
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- Projection met statewide schema
- # —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) County parcel fabric contains gaps.
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# **ER LAYERS – PLSS**

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# HER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Burnett County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **₩** ZIP4 ZIP4: Approximately 4 records with values that appear to be the first 4 digits of the ZIPCODE values. ZIP4 values should be the four additional digits appended to the 5-digit zip code. Assign a value of true SQL < Null> to records without a ZIP4 for future data submissions. **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema # —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) • County parcel fabric contains gaps. ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Calumet County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA RCEL FEATURE CLASS There are errors on this report PARCELID which have reoccurred. The TAXPARCELID county will be asked to certify **✓** PARCELDATE that these i<mark>ssues will</mark> be rectified **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** prior to the next submission on ✓ OWNERNME1 the grant application. ✓ OWNERNME2 If flagged errors are observed in PSTLADRESS the future, the county's data **✓ SITEADRESS** will not be assessed **ADDNUMPREFIX** until it is free from **ADDNUM** annually repeated **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 STATE SCHOOLDIST: Approximately 274 records with school district name values of 'SCHOOL DISTRICT OF CHILTON', 'SCHOOL DISTRICT OF NEW HOLSTEIN', 'SCHOOL DISTRICT OF STOCKBRIDGE', 'BRILLION PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT.' These have the words "SCHOOL DISTRICT" at the beginning of the name instead of at the end. Move "SCHOOL DISTRICT" to the end of the district name and remove "OF" (e.g., CHILTON SCHOOL DISTRICT). Consult the Submission Documentation for guidance on standardized SCHOOLDIST values. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **CNTASSDVALUE** LNDVALUE **✓** IMPVALUE **✓** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE NETPRPTA** GRSPRPTA PROPCLASS – with standardized domains AUXCLASS: At least 372 parcels missing values in PROPCLASS/AUXCLASS fields. For future data submissions, please work on ensuring the completeness of values in PROPCLASS/AUXCLASS. To acquire missing data and resolve this issue for future data submissions, you may need to work with your real property lister and/or local assessor(s). Approximately 194 records with unstandardized values in AUXCLASS field (e.g., 'FM6,' 'FM7,' and 'FM8') which appeared only in the Calumet County data. This was noted on a previous year's Observation Report and was not resolved for V6. Please communicate with DOA prior to the next data submission cycle so that the obstacle to standardizing these AUXCLASS domains can be better understood and try to rectify this before next year's submission. AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES DEEDACRES GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) # —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS - PLSS

# PLSS - PLSS corner data was submitted

**CONDOS**: In initial data submission, condo data was not included, because, as it was noted in Explain-Certification portion of Submission Form, the Condo Stack Tool still did not work with the Calumet County data. For future submissions, please contact the SCO technical team if the county needs assistance running the Condo Stack Tool or if there are any other questions prior to preparing data submission.

**PLSS**: According to WLIP records, the county received Strategic Initiative grant funding to work toward achieving Benchmark #4 Completion and Integration of PLSS (for the year 2016). According to the Benchmark #4 requirement, all PLSS corner coordinate values established using Strategic Initiative funds should be tagged with their appropriate accuracy class (Survey Grade, Sub-meter, or Approximate). Therefore, we expected to see the "**horiz\_accuracy**" field populated. Please make sure to populate for future submissions.

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

/ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Pro	oject OBSERVATION REPORT <b>Chippewa County</b>
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2	
✓ PSTLADRESS	
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	
✓ ADDNUM	
ADDNUMSUFFIX	
	<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 1 record with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field ('W PARK') Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
✓ UNITTYPE	
✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
✓ CNTASSDVALUE	
✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
✓ ESTFMKVALUE	
✓ NETPRPTA	
✓ GRSPRPTA	
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ ASSDACRES	
✓ DEEDACRES	
✓ GISACRES	
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
✓ —Projection met statewide schema	
✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS – PLSS	

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

## SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 STATE • SCHOOLDIST: Approximately 5 records had SCHOOLDIST values that did not adhere to the standardized domains for this field ('STANLEY-BOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT' and 'MARSHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT'). Ensure that school district names adhere to **\* SCHOOLDIST** – with standardized domains the statewide schema domains for future data submissions. ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA PROPCLASS – with standardized domains **\*** AUXCLASS – with standardized domains AUXCLASS: Approximately 10 records with values of 'MW6.' This value is not in the acceptable domain list and may be either a typo or error. Ensure that values adhere to the standardized domain list for future data submissions. **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema **ER LAYERS – PLSS** ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) \* Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. **Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 • **PSTLADRESS**: Approximately 8 records with values like 'COMMISSION, '; 'FERRYVILLE, WI 54628' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. PSTLADRESS **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE MFLVALUE **ESTFMKVALUE**: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE value, however, some special cases where the field 23 MiNVADD does not apply schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~24 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES GISACRES CONAME** – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema # —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) County parcel fabric contains gaps. ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS - PLSS **\* PLSS** – PLSS corner data was submitted • PLSS: For future data submissions, submit a digital PLSS layer when one is available. HER LAYERS – RML Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county) \* Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. **Zoning**: **Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)

- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6 Final Report*. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA S
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS	
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS	
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
* PARCELDATE	<ul> <li>PARCELDATE: Approximately 5 records with a value of '01/01/0100.' If a value for the date of last geometric edit is not known, enter a true SQL <null> for these records in Parcel Date field.</null></li> </ul>
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2 <b>※</b> PSTLADRESS	• PSTI ADRESS: Approximately 179 records with values like 'NOT PROVIDED NOT PROVIDED WI 99999': 'NOT PROVIDED
* PSTLADRESS	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 179 records with values like 'NOT PROVIDED, NOT PROVIDED WI 99999'; 'NOT PROVIDED, SAUK CITY WI 53583'; 'NOT PROVIDED, BLACK EARTH WI 53515'; 'NOT AVAILABLE, NOT AVAILABLE WI 99999' et cetera.</li> </ul>
	Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing address.</null>
✓ SITEADRESS	
<ul><li>✓ ADDNUMPREFIX</li><li>※ ADDNUM</li></ul>	• ADDNUM: Approximately 34 records with values such as '9094' '331D' '10904' et cetera that appear to contain
	<ul> <li>ADDNUM: Approximately 34 records with values such as '909A,' '331D,' '1090A,' et cetera that appear to contain ADDNUMSUFFIX values. Ensure ADDNUMSUFFIX values are placed in the appropriate field.</li> </ul>
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX ✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ LANDMARKNAME	* LINITTYPE: Approximately 558 records with approximated values like 'APT' 'STE' 'TDLP' at catera which should be fully smalled
* UNITTYPE	<ul> <li>UNITTYPE: Approximately 558 records with abbreviated values like 'APT,' 'STE,' 'TRLR,' et cetera which should be fully-spelled out (as called for by the statewide schema and explained in V4_Final_Report).</li> </ul>
✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
✓ CNTASSDVALUE  ✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
<b>₩</b> MFLVALUE	<ul> <li>MFLVALUE: In initial data submission, MFLVALUE field did not have accurate values for 986 'W5-W9' AUXCLASS records, but this was corrected upon re-submit.</li> </ul>
* ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) ▶ ~24,684 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9)  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ NETPRPTA	Inere are
✓ GRSPRPTA	errors on this report which have reoccurred. The
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	county will be asked to certify
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES	that these issues will be rectified
✓ ASSUACRES  ✓ DEEDACRES	prior to the next submission on
✓ GISACRES	the grant application.  If flagged errors are observed in
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains	the future, the county's data
✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	will not be assessed
✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	until it is free from
<ul> <li>✓ —Projection met statewide schema</li> <li>✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> </ul>	annually repeated errors.
✓ —County parcer rabric was complete (lacked gaps)  ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	GII
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS – RML	
* Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	<ul> <li>Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated prior to submitting for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	(Not adapted to a growth)
▼ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names	• (Not administered by county)
SUBMISSION FORM &	
✓ Provided .ini submission form + data	
MISCELLANEOUS	
Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's seem Reoccurring issues that Dane County has repeatedly not a need to dissolve on PARCELID or some other method schema requirements, and while the county may not moved in the strategy of the purposes of addressing states. The extra effort to integrate City of Madison tax roll data City Assessor/DFaust@cityofmadison.com. Ideally, City Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission.	describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable (i), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the VT-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the chema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. It rectified before submitting data include stacking parcels by SITEADRESS (e.g., for dorms, apartments, et cetera—where there is I that will result in one parcel polygon per PARCELID) and failure to convert nulls to true SQL <null> values. These are statewide aintain the data this way or may have logical disagreements on the specifications, they remain requirements. WLIP Strategic utory directives and to aid the county in preparing standard Searchable Format data that meets *all* schema requirements. ta for V6 is appreciated. For V4, the technical team acquired the tax roll data for Madison through a request made to the of Madison data should continue to be requested and integrated by the county. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6. Final_Report and the V5. Final_Report. There are numerous users of to make the county's data available in a standardized format!</null>

ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Pro	oject OBSERVATION REPORT <b>Dodge County</b>
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS	
/ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2	
✓ PSTLADRESS	
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	
✓ ADDNUM	
ADDNUMSUFFIX	
✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
✓ UNITTYPE	
✓ UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
LNDVALUE	
/ IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE	
* ESTFMKVALUE	<ul> <li>ESTFMKVALUE: In initial submission—for the City of Watertown—there were 2,820 records with a value of '0' for Estimated Fair Market Value, Net Property Tax, and Gross Property Tax, which was corrected upon re-submit. Obtain, integrate, and submit all necessary City of Watertown data for future data submissions. The county's extra effort to integrate this municipal data is appreciated.</li> <li>The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:         <ul> <li>Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)</li> <li>~21 records; in City of Watertown</li> <li>Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9)</li> <li>~26 records in the county's V6 submittal</li> <li>Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
✓ NETPRPTA	
✓ GRSPRPTA	
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES	
DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
-Projection met statewide schema	
—County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS - RML	
✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	

- $\textbf{Zoning: Shoreland} with \ \mathsf{DESCRIPTION/LINK}$ • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ♦ Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Door County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE **✓ MFLVALUE** ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **NETPRPTA** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains

- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# OTHER LAYERS – RML

- \* Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- In the initial submission, zoning layer feature class was empty. Please verify that ALL information is complete for future data submissions
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ♦ **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Douglas County

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	S
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2	
* PSTLADRESS	• PSTLADRESS: Approximately 5 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as '.
	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 5 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as ', SUPERIOR, WI 54880', and ', ,.' Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing address.</null></li> </ul>
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX ✓ ADDNUM	
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
* PREFIX – with standardized domains	• <b>PREFIX</b> : Approximately 3,658 records with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field—such as '1110 E 4TH ST'; '701 N 6TH ST' et cetera. Ensure that PREFIX values are appropriately populated for future data submissions.
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ <b>STREETTYPE</b> – with standardized domains	
✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ LANDMARKNAME	
✓ UNITTYPE	
✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME	
✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
✓ CNTASSDVALUE	
✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
* ESTFMKVALUE	<ul> <li>ESTFMKVALUE: In initial submission there were 25,317 records containing property classes where where a value in the ESTFMKVALUE field was expected, but contained a value of '0', which was corrected upon re-submit. Thank you for your continued attention to such issues for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
	continued attention to such issues for future data submissions.  The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ NETPRPTA	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ PProjection met statewide schema	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
<ul> <li>✓ GRSPRPTA</li> <li>✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ ASSDACRES</li> <li>✓ DEEDACRES</li> <li>✓ GISACRES</li> <li>✓ CONAME – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ Projection met statewide schema</li> <li>✓ County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> <li>✓ Condo modeling met statewide schema</li> <li>OTHER LAYERS – PLSS</li> </ul>	ESTEMICYALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA  ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ ASSDACRES  ✓ DEEDACRES  ✓ GISACRES  ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains  ✓ PORCELSRC – with standardize	ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal
<ul> <li>✓ GRSPRPTA</li> <li>✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ ASSDACRES</li> <li>✓ DEEDACRES</li> <li>✓ GISACRES</li> <li>✓ CONAME – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ Projection met statewide schema</li> <li>✓ County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> <li>✓ Condo modeling met statewide schema</li> <li>OTHER LAYERS – PLSS</li> <li>✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted</li> <li>OTHER LAYERS – RML</li> </ul>	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA     ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ ASSDACRES     ✓ DEEDACRES     ✓ GISACRES     ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains     ✓ Projection met statewide schema     ✓ — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     ✓ — Condo modeling met statewide schema     ✓ THER LAYERS — PLSS     ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted     ✓ THER LAYERS — RML     ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA     ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ ASSDACRES     ✓ DEEDACRES     ✓ GISACRES     ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains     ✓ Projection met statewide schema     ✓ — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     ✓ — Condo modeling met statewide schema     ✓ THER LAYERS — PLSS     ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted     ✓ THER LAYERS — RML     ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ※ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal  - (Not administered by county)  • (Not administered by county)  • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
✓ GRSPRPTA     ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ ASSDACRES     ✓ DEEDACRES     ✓ GISACRES     ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains     ✓ Projection met statewide schema     ✓ — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     ✓ — Condo modeling met statewide schema     ✓ THER LAYERS — PLSS     ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted     ✓ THER LAYERS — RML     ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ✓ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ GRSPRPTA     ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ ASSDACRES     ✓ DEEDACRES     ✓ GISACRES     ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains     ✓ Projection met statewide schema     ✓ — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     ✓ — Condo modeling met statewide schema     ✓ THER LAYERS — PLSS     ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted     ✓ THER LAYERS — RML     ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ※ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal  - (Not administered by county)  • (Not administered by county)  • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
✓ GRSPRPTA     ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains     ✓ ASSDACRES     ✓ DEEDACRES     ✓ GISACRES     ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains     ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains     ✓ Projection met statewide schema     ✓ — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     ✓ — Condo modeling met statewide schema     ✓ THER LAYERS — PLSS     ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted     ✓ THER LAYERS — RML     ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ✓ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	ESIFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~227 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~8 records in the county's V6 submittal  - (Not administered by county)  • (Not administered by county)  • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Dunn County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 • **PSTLADRESS**: Approximately 193 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'BOYCEVILLE WI 54725'; 'DOWNING WI 54734'; 'MENOMONIE WI 54751' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. **\*** PSTLADRESS **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **NETPRPTA** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema ER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) **Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2

- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- MFLVALUE
- **\*** ESTFMKVALUE

- ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:

  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)

  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~133 records in the county's V6 submittal

  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)

- ✓ NFTPRPTA
- ✓ GRSPRPTA
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- ASSDACRES
- DEEDACRES
- GISACRES
- **CONAME** with standardized domains
- PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# OTHER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "http://www.co.eau-claire.wi.us/home/showdocument?id=16224." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records prior to submitting for future data submissions.
- ♦ **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: ~4 records with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field—such as '2661 W MARBLE R'; '1254 W PIERCE LN' et cetera. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. PREFIX - with standardized domains STREETNAME: ~6 records requiring attention or correction. ~1 record with a value of 'CTN NORTH' containing a PREFIX element. Remove prefix value from STREETNAME field to PREFIX field. Consult Submission Documentation on the use of PREFIX field to hold pre-directionals (which should be abbreviated). ~1 record with 'LAKE RD SOUTH' in this field—'RD' should be spelled out and moved to the STREETTYPE field and 'SOUTH' should be standardized to 'S' and moved to the SUFFIX field. **STREETNAME** > SIDELY TIELD. > The street type abbreviation still attached to the street name, such as 'BASS LAKE CUT OFF RD.' This value should be moved to STREETTYPE field and spelled out to 'ROAD.' > 3 records with STREETNAME values of 'TOWN ROAD NORTH' where 'NORTH' should be 'N' per SITEADRESS values. Some of these issues were also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving them price to the next annual data submission. them prior to the next annual data submission. **STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains There are **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains errors on this report **LANDMARKNAME** which have reoccurred. The UNITTYPE county will be asked to certify UNITID that these issues will be rectified **✓ PLACENAME** prior to the next submission on **✓** ZIPCODE the grant application. ZIP4 If flagged errors are observed in **✓** STATE the future, the county's data ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains will not be assessed ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains until it is free from **✓ CNTASSDVALUE** annually repeated LNDVALUE errors. ✓ IMPVALUE MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) ▶ ~1,696 records in the county's V6 submittal - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) **\* ESTFMKVALUE** NETPRPTA: In initial data submission, values for NETPRPTA (Net Property Tax) and GRSPRPTA (Gross Property Tax) were '0' for all records in the dataset. Either NETPRPTA or GRSPRPTA is required and should be populated as appropriate. **\*** NETPRPTA **GRSPRPTA** ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES GISACRES CONAME**: Approximately 282 records submitted with a value of <Null> for the fields CONAME/PARCELSRC/PARCELFIPS. Populate these 3 fields for ALL records (including non-parcel features) in the dataset. **\*** CONAME – with standardized domains **\* PARCELFIPS** – with standardized domains PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · (Not administered by county) **Zoning**: **Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data MISCELLANEOUS The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable

- Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Error flag numbers in the Validation Tool were inflated due to the presence of string values of '<Null>', blanks, and string values in lower case letters. In the future, running the
- Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) prior to submitting may be required to help you correct this prior to uploading your data. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- **PARCELDATE**
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- GRSPRPTA
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

**\* PLSS** – PLSS corner data was submitted

PLSS: According to WLIP records, the county received Strategic Initiative grant funding to work toward achieving Benchmark #4 Completion and Integration of PLSS (for the years 2016-2017). According to the Benchmark #4 requirement, all PLSS corner coordinate values established using Strategic Initiative funds should be tagged with their appropriate accuracy class (Survey Grade, Sub-meter, or Approximate). Therefore, we expected to see the "horiz\_accuracy" field populated. Please make sure to populate for future submissions.

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

# MISCELLANEOUS

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

09/15/2020 | Fond du Lac | Page 1 of 1

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX** ADDNUM: Approximately 1 record with missing value in ADDNUM according to site address (SITEADRESS = '600 E PIONEER **ADDNUM** ST' and ADDNUM is <Null>) **ADDNUMSUFFIX**: Approximately 1 record with missing value in ADDNUMSUFFIX according to site address (SITEADRESS = '605A S GRANDVIEW AVE'). **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX. Approximately 10 records missing PREFIX values (based on values in SITEADRESS field). Ensure that all elements of the SITEADRESS field (including PREFIX values) are accurately parsed and placed into their individual address element fields. Thanks for improving this issue for V6, as it was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report, and for continuing to the interior than the first feet there exhibites for the province in the second provinc **PREFIX** – with standardized domains give it attention for future submissions. **STREETNAME**: Approximately 1 record with value that still had STREETTYPE value attached to street name. Move street type values (for 'OLD 139 RD') to STREETTYPE field. **STREETNAME** One record needs some clean up—'CTY HWY WEST.' Highway values are associated with the PREFIX field. Take care not to mistakenly spell-out STREETNAME values like 'NORTH', 'WEST' when a single alpha letter ('W') is intended. See Submission Documentation for guidance on highway prefix values. **STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 STATE SCHOOLDIST: Approximately 1,269 records with a value of 'GOODMANARMSTRONG CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT' that does not match the required standardized domain of 'GOODMAN-ARMSTRONG CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT' for this field and, as **\* SCHOOLDIST** – with standardized domains such, were flagged by the Validation Tool. Ensure that school district names and school district numbers adhere to the statewide schema domains for future data submissions ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ➤ ~281 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ➤ ~26 records in the county's V6 submittal **\*** ESTFMKVALUE **✓** NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains AUXCLASS - with standardized domains ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES **✓** GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS - with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema HER LAYERS – P **\* PLSS** – PLSS corner data was submitted • PLSS: Thank you for submitting the county's first available digital PLSS layer for V6! OTHER LAYERS – RML \* Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. **\* Zoning: Shoreland** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available **\* Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. Other Layers - with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

09/15/2020 | Forest | Page 1 of 1

		ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
	PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
<b>✓</b>	PARCELID	
	TAXPARCELID	
	PARCELDATE	
	TAXROLLYEAR	
	OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2	
	PSTLADRESS	
	SITEADRESS	
*	ADDNUMPREFIX	• <b>ADDNUMPREFIX</b> : Approximately 1 record with a value of '8675.' This appears to be an ADDNUM value placed in the wrong field. Ensure values like this are placed in the appropriate field for future data submissions.
$\checkmark$	ADDNUM	
<b>√</b>	ADDNUMSUFFIX	
*	PREFIX – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 2,895 records with a directional prefix value of "N," "S," "E," or "W" present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
*	STREETNAME	• STREETNAME: Approximately 123 records with mistakenly spelled-out STREETNAME values of 'NORTH,' 'SOUTH,' or 'EAST' and a PREFIX value of 'CTH' (indicating county highways). These street name values should not be spelled out, as they are not indicating a directional, but are instead a letter associated with a COUNTY HIGHWAY. Check your export routine for county highways named with alpha characters and ensure the accuracy of STREETNAME values for future data submissions.
<b>✓</b>	STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
_	SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
$\leq$	LANDMARKNAME	
<u> </u>	UNITTYPE UNITID	
	PLACENAME	
	ZIPCODE	
<b>/</b>	ZIP4	
<b>✓</b>	STATE	
<b>✓</b>	SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
	SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
	CNTASSDVALUE	
	IMPVALUE	
	MFLVALUE	
*	ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~90 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~19 records in the county's V6 submittal
	NETPRPTA	
	GRSPRPTA	
	PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
	ASSDACRES	
	DEEDACRES	
<b>✓</b>	GISACRES	
<b>✓</b>	<b>CONAME</b> – with standardized domains	
	PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
	PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
	—Projection met statewide schema     —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
	—County parcel labric was complete (lacked gaps)     —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
	OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
<b>✓</b>	PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
	OTHER LAYERS – RML	
<b>✓</b>	Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	• (Not administered by county)
_	Other Layers – with standardized file names	
	SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	
<b>/</b>	Provided .ini submission form + data	
	MISCELLANEOUS  The control of the late of the control of the contr	
	Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's see Feedback on the annual parcel data submission processee Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission.	describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable (), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the chema specifications. It is simplified in the specifications of the second of

09/15/2020 | Grant | Page 1 of 1

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Green Lake County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS: Approximately 180 records with partial mailing address values containing partial value or only city, state, and zip—such as 'WILD ROSE, WI 54984.' Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. **\* PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID** PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓** DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema

- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### **OTHER LAYERS – PLSS**

# PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

PLSS: According to WLIP records, the county received Strategic Initiative grant funding to work toward achieving Benchmark #4 Completion and Integration of PLSS (for the years 2016-2020). According to the Benchmark #4 requirement, all PLSS corner coordinate values established using Strategic Initiative funds should be tagged with their appropriate accuracy class (Survey Grade, Sub-meter, or Approximate). Therefore, we expected to see the "horiz\_accuracy" field populated. Please make sure to populate for future submissions.

# **OTHER LAYERS – RML**

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- **PARCELID**
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# **ER LAYERS – PLSS**

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	• <b>PSTLADRESS</b> : Approximately 29 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as
PSTLADRESS	*ASHLAND, WI 54806-0000'; 'HURLEY, WI 54534-0000' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing address. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.</null>
✓ SITEADRESS	<u> </u>
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	There are errors on this report
✓ ADDNUM	which have reoccurred. The
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	county will be asked to certify
✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	that these issues will be rectified
STREETNAME  CTREETTYPE with standarding did assiste	prior to the next submission on
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains ✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	the gr <mark>ant appli</mark> cation.
✓ LANDMARKNAME	If flagged errors are observed in
✓ UNITTYPE	the future, the county's data will not be assessed
✓ UNITID	until it is free from
✓ PLACENAME	annually repeated
✓ ZIPCODE	errors.
✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
<b>₩</b> ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market
	value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the
	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ► ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ NETPRPTA	value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ► ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ► ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ PROJECTION – with standardized domains	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ POJECTION MET STANDARD STAN	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ PROJECTION – with standardized domains	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ POJECTION MET STANDARD STAN	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ Projection met statewide schema ✓ County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	- Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~1,963 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ POJECTION met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS	<ul> <li>Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning class within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.coiron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&amp;%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.</li> </ul>
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ POPOJECTION met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS — RML	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.coiron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS – RML  Q Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.
✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES ✓ GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS — RML  ② Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.co.iron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.  * (Not administered by county)
✓ GRSPRPTA  ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ ASSDACRES  ✓ DEEDACRES  ✓ GISACRES  ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains  ✓ POJECTION met statewide schema  ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)  ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS  ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS — RML  ② Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names  SUBMISSION FORM &  PORM &  PACKAGE	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.co.iron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.  * (Not administered by county)
✓ GRSPRPTA  ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ ASSDACRES  ✓ DEEDACRES  ✓ GISACRES  ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  ✓ Projection met statewide schema  ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)  ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS  ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS — RML  ② Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Toning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names  SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE  ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.co.iron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.  * (Not administered by county)
✓ GRSPRPTA  ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ✓ ASSDACRES  ✓ DEEDACRES  ✓ GISACRES  ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains  ✓ POJECTION met statewide schema  ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)  ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS — PLSS  ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS — RML  ② Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names  SUBMISSION FORM &  PORM &  PACKAGE	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.co.iron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=16951&%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.  * (Not administered by county)
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains  AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ASSDACRES  DEEDACRES  GISACRES  CONAME – with standardized domains  PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains  PARCELSRC – with standardized domains  Projection met statewide schema  — County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)  — Condo modeling met statewide schema  OTHER LAYERS – PLSS  PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS – RML  Coning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  Cother Layers – with standardized file names  SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE  Provided .ini submission form + data  MISCELLANEOUS  The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a datasets submitted in the future exactly match DoA's s Feedback on the annual parcel data submission proces  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission proces	* Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.coiron.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=1695/18e%20locid=180." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future submisson. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.  * (Not administered by county)

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- **PARCELID**
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

# **ER LAYERS – PLSS**

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Jefferson County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE **ESTFMKVALUE**: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ► ~90 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~52 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NFTPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains DEEDACRES **GISACRES CONAME** – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)

- ASSDACRES

- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6 Final\_Report* and the *V5 Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ODCEDVATION DEDODT I
ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Pr	oject OBSERVATION REPORT Juneau County
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
PARCELID	
TAXPARCELID	
PARCELDATE	
TAXROLLYEAR	
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
F PSTLADRESS	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 4 records with incomplete PSTLADRESS values like 'UNKOWN MAUSTON WI 53948';'         UNKOWN NEW LISBON WI 53950.' Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a         complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter a true SQL <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing         address.</null></li> </ul>
SITEADRESS	
ADDNUMPREFIX	
ADDNUM	
ADDNUMSUFFIX	
PREFIX – with standardized domains	
STREETNAME	
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains  LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE	
UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
LNDVALUE	
IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE	
<b>ESTFMKVALUE</b>	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~294 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~25 records in the county's V6 submittal
NETPRPTA	
GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
-Projection met statewide schema	
—County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
—Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
This has been been all the second	

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# **OTHER LAYERS – RML**

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **\* Zoning: Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

## SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Kenosha County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2** PSTLADRESS: Approximately 1 record with partial mailing address value containing only city, state, and zip—'0000, BASSETT WI 53101.' Enter a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS, or <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address **\*** PSTLADRESS SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE**: Approximately 1 record with a STREETTYPE missing per the SITEADRESS field ('8400 LAKEVIEW PKWY'). Ensure that street type values are accurately populated and spelled-out (e.g., 'PARKWAY'). STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID** PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓** DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
PARCELDATE	
TAXROLLYEAR	
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
PSTLADRESS	
SITEADRESS ADDNUMPREFIX	
/ ADDNUM	
/ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
PREFIX – with standardized domains	• PREFIX: Approximately 185 records with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from the PREFIX field (e.g., 'N3569 E TOWNLINE RD'; 'E5559 W WILSON RD'; '215 N MAIN ST'; '1213 S MAIN ST'). Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately and ensure accurate parsing of individual address elements into their respective fields for future data submissions.
STREETNAME	
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE	
UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
/ LNDVALUE	
/ IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE	
ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ➤ ~45 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
/ NETPRPTA	Tax exempt (Noxethas XI X-)
✓ GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES	
/ DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
—Projection met statewide schema	
<ul> <li>County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> <li>Condo modeling met statewide schema</li> </ul>	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS – RML	
Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	• (Not administered by county)
Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	• (Not administered by county)
Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	• (Not administered by county)
Other Layers – with standardized file names	
SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT La Crosse County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE **ESTFMKVALUE**: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~159 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~20 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NFTPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains DEEDACRES **GISACRES CONAME** – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)

- ASSDACRES

- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6 Final\_Report* and the *V5 Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Lafayette County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME**: Approximately 5 records for what should be STREETNAME = '1ST AVENUE' (which was submitted as street name of '1ST ' with STREETTYPE of 'AVENUE EXTENSION'). In this case, the word 'EXTENSION' should be the value of the STREETTYPE field and the STREETNAME value should be '1ST AVENUE.' Please make note of this for future data submissions. **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID** PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓** DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema

- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **Zoning: Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** • TAXROLLYEAR: In initial data submission, there were approximately 6,969 records with a TAXROLLYEAR of '2018' (24% of all records submitted) when the most common value for V6 was '2019.' This issue was resolved upon re-submit. For future data **\*** TAXROLLYEAR submissions, double check to ensure that tax roll year is populated with accurate values. **✓ OWNERNME1** OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS • SITEADRESS: Approximately 13,033 records with values containing 'CITY ST ZIP' or some portion of those values attached to the expected value (Full Physical Street Address). This field should only contain the street portion of the SITEADRESS. For SITEADRESS future data submissions, do not include 'CITY, STATE, ZIP' anywhere in the SITEADRESS value. **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM** ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 11 records with values like '848,' '219,' '614,' et cetera. These appear to be secondary address numbers (based on the values in the SITEADRESS field). Remove secondary values from the ADDNUMSUFFIX field, **ADDNUMSUFFIX** and also ensure address number values are not a range. **PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains SUFFIX - with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID: Approximately 8 records with values that are inappropriately placed in this field. 6 appear to be secondary address numbers that should be set to <Null> and 2 appear to be values of 'E' that should be placed in the SUFFIX field. UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 ✓ STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE** LNDVALUE **✓** IMPVALUE **✓** MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~362 records in the county's V6 submittal **✓ ESTFMKVALUE** Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~21 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **ASSDACRES** DEEDACRES GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema **ER LAYERS – PLSS** ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field **Quantity Qeneral** − with DESCRIPTION/LINK with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "http://www.co.langlade.wi.us/if/files/Langlade%20County %20Ordinance%20Code%20Book%20Chapter%2017.pdf." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future data submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. ♦ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) ✓ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6\_Final\_Report* and the *V5\_Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

/ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database P	Project OBSERVATION REPORT Lincoln County
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
DADCEL FEATURE CLAS	
PARCEL FEATURE CLAS	<b>3</b>
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
<b>₩</b> OWNERNME1	• OWNERNME1: See comment below in AUXCLASS.
✓ OWNERNME2	
* PSTLADRESS	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 111 records with incomplete PSTLADRESS values like '(ASSESSED WITH LOTS)'; 'IRMA WI 54442'; 'PARK CIR WI; 'MERRILL WI 54452' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter a true SQL <null> for parcels without a *complete mailing address.</null></li> </ul>
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	
✓ ADDNUM	
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	
STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
✓ UNITTYPE ✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME	
✓ ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
✓ CNTASSDVALUE	
✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
<b>✓ ESTFMKVALUE</b>	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9)  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~20 records in the county's V6 submittal
✓ NETPRPTA	
✓ GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
* AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>AUXCLASS: There may be an issue with some tax exempt properties that requires attention. Several records with AUXCLASS value 'X1' for federally-owned land had puzzling values, such as 'STATE OF WISCONSIN -DNR' and 'STATE OF WISCONSIN -DOT' (e.g., https://maps.sco.wisc.edu/Parcels/?query=Parcels_3213,PARCELID,00233070629994). While these AUXCLASS/OWNERNME1 values could be legitimate (especially for special situations like trust land, easements, et cetera), they could either be indicative of: a) erroneous owner names in OWNERNME1 or b) incorrect values in AUXCLASS. Check your owner names and AUXCLASS values for tax exempt parcels and ensure accuracy of values in AUXCLASS/OWNERNME1 fields for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
✓ ASSDACRES	
DEEDACRES	
✓ GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
<ul> <li>✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains</li> <li>✓ —Projection met statewide schema</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>✓ —Projection met statewide schema</li> <li>✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> </ul>	
✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS – PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS – RML	
✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
♦ <b>Zoning</b> : <b>Shoreland</b> – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	(Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)

- ♦ **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

• The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

• Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

• Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Pr	oject OBSERVATION REPORT Manitowoc County
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
PARCELID	
TAXPARCELID	
PARCELDATE	
TAXROLLYEAR	• TAXROLLYEAR: Approximately 303 records with a TAXROLLYEAR of '2018' when the expected value was '2019' (based on PARCELDATE provided). For future data submissions, ensure that tax roll year is populated with accurate values.  • Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. As such, future tax roll year records should be <null> in all assessment/tax roll fields (i.e., CNTASSDVALUE, INDVALUE, IMPVALUE, ESTFMKVALUE, NETPRPTA, GRSPRPTA, PROPCLASS, ASSDACRES). Null values for records with future tax roll years in these fields.</null>
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
PSTLADRESS	
SITEADRESS	
ADDNUMPREFIX	
ADDNUM	
ADDNUMSUFFIX	
PREFIX – with standardized domains	
STREETNAME	
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE	
UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
LNDVALUE	
IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE	
ESTFMKVALUE	
NETPRPTA	
GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	• PROPCLASS: See comment below in AUXCLASS.
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>AUXCLASS: In initial data submission, the City of Manitowoc data was integrated in the county's submission. However, there were approximately 551 records with AUXCLASS <null> and PROPCLASS values of '7.' In previous years, most of these records (per PARCELID and OWNERNME1) had AUXCLASS values of 'X3' and 'X4' and PROPCLASS was <null>. Thank you for re-submitting data for the 551 records and making note of this issue for future data submissions.</null></null></li> <li>The City of Two Rivers data was also integrated in the county's data submittal, however, it was from 2018 (instead of 2019 as called for) and all records were missing PROPCLASS/AUXCLASS values.</li> </ul>
ASSDACRES	
DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
—Projection met statewide schema	
—County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
—Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
PISS - PISS corner data was submitted	

### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **\* Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- \*Thanks for making airport layer available. Airport layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a **DESCRIPTION** of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a **LINK** to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "www.co.manitowoc.wi. us/media/1952/chapter-11-2014-1219.pdf." For future submissions ensure DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated.
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

# **MISCELLANEOUS**

- The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Please continue to work with the City of Manitowoc and City of Two Rivers to contribute current, complete parcel/tax roll data, so that the county can integrate and submit a complete, comprehensive county parcel dataset. Svanderveren@two-rivers.org and ricpow@two-rivers.org at the City of Two Rivers were able to provide partial tax roll data in the past (but it could not be utilized because it was missing PROPCLASS/AUXCLASS and school district information). Manitowoc County's extra efforts to acquire and integrate this independent municipal data into the future are appreciated!

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6\_Final\_Report* and the *V5\_Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 • PSTLADRESS: Approximately 88 records with values like ' 'BIRNAMWOOD, WI 54414-0911' and ' 'LAST OWNER OF RECORD, \* PSTLADRESS , WI.: Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. **SITEADRESS** ADDNUMPREFIX: Approximately 44 records missing ADDNUMPREFIX values, but address number prefix values were present in the SITEADRESS field. When compared to SITEADRESS, ensure that all individual address element fields are populated as appropriate for future data submissions. **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM** ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 12 records with values like (A)', '(B)', '(C)', '(D).' Clean these records by removing the parentheses in the ADDNUMSUFFIX field and ensure the accuracy of values in this field for future data submissions. **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains LANDMARKNAME UNITTYPE UNITID PLACENAME ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓ NETPRPTA** ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES DEEDACRES GISACRES **CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK **Zoning**: **Shoreland** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) **Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)

- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

#### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Marinette County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS: Approximately 5 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'CRIVITZ, WI 54114-0000'; 'LAKEWOOD, WI 54138-0000' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \* PSTLADRESS \*complete\* mailing address. **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **NETPRPTA** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema HER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

#### OTHER LAYERS – RML

\* Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

- Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "https://www.marinettecounty.com/i\_marinette/d/Administration/ordinances/chapter\_17\_5.29.18.pdf." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future data submissions. records for future data submissions.
- **\* Zoning: Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names

#### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

		ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA S
	PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	S Commence of the commence of
<b>✓</b>	PARCELID	
_	TAXPARCELID	
_	PARCELDATE	
_	TAXROLLYEAR OWNERNME1	
_	OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2	
_	PSTLADRESS	
<b>/</b>	SITEADRESS	
✓	ADDNUMPREFIX	
<b>√</b>	ADDNUM	
*	ADDNUMSUFFIX	<ul> <li>ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 5 records with values of '222', '520', '308', and '248.' These appear to be secondary address numbers, based on the values in the SITEADRESS field. Omit or set these values to a true SQL <null> for future data submissions.</null></li> </ul>
*	PREFIX – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 1,377 records with a prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field ("N," "S," "E," or "W"), but missing a corresponding value in the PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
*	STREETNAME	<ul> <li>STREETNAME: Approximately 322 records with mistakenly spelled-out STREETNAME values of 'NORTH,' 'EAST,' and a PREFIX value of 'CTH' (indicating county highways). These street name values should not be spelled out, as they are not indicating a directional, but are instead a letter associated with a COUNTY HIGHWAY. Check your export routine for county highways named with alpha characters and ensure the accuracy of STREETNAME values for future data submissions.</li> <li>Approximately 1 record with a value of '2ND AVE' and STREETTYPE is <null>. 'AVE' should be placed in STREETTYPE field and spelled out for future data submissions.</null></li> </ul>
<u> </u>	STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
<u> </u>	SUFFIX – with standardized domains  LANDMARKNAME	
<u> </u>	UNITTYPE	
<u>,                                     </u>	UNITID	
<b>/</b>	PLACENAME	
<b>✓</b>	ZIPCODE	
_	ZIP4	
_	STATE	
_	SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
_	CNTASSDVALUE	
_	LNDVALUE	
<b>✓</b>	IMPVALUE	
- 100	MFLVALUE	
*	ESTFMKVALUE	<ul> <li>ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:         <ul> <li>Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)</li> <li>Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9)</li> <li>~219 records in the county's V6 submittal</li> <li>Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>✓</b>	NETPRPTA	
_	GRSPRPTA	
	PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
_	AUXCLASS – with standardized domains  ASSDACRES	
_	DEEDACRES	
_	GISACRES	
<b>/</b>	CONAME – with standardized domains	
_	PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
	PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
	—Projection met statewide schema     —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
_	-Condo modeling met statewide schema	
	OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
<b>✓</b>	PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
	OTHER LAYERS – RML	
	Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	(Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)      (Not administrated by county)
_	Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	(Not administered by county)     (Not administered by county)
	Other Layers – with standardized file names	(Not during and of county)
	SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	
<b>✓</b>	Provided .ini submission form + data	
	MISCELLANEOUS	
		describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the
	<ul> <li>Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission</li> </ul>	describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the schema specifications. sis is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.  You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6_Final_Report and the V5_Final_Report. There are numerous users of to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

PARCEL FEATURE CLASS
WITH TAX ROLL DATA

PARCELID

**TAXPARCELID** 

PARCELDATE

**✓ TAXROLLYEAR** 

✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2** 

**✓ PSTLADRESS** 

**✓** SITEADRESS

**ADDNUMPREFIX** 

**ADDNUM** 

**ADDNUMSUFFIX** 

**PREFIX** – with standardized domains

**STREETNAME** 

STREETTYPE – with standardized domains

**SUFFIX** – with standardized domains

**LANDMARKNAME** 

UNITTYPE

UNITID

✓ PLACENAME

**✓** ZIPCODE

**✓** ZIP4

STATE

✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains

✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains

**✓ CNTASSDVALUE** 

**✓ LNDVALUE** 

**✓** IMPVALUE

**✓ MFLVALUE** 

✓ ESTFMKVALUE

**NETPRPTA** 

**GRSPRPTA** 

✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains

✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains

**✓** ASSDACRES

**✓ DEEDACRES** 

**✓** GISACRES

✓ CONAME – with standardized domains

✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains

**PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains

-Projection met statewide schema

✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)

✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

## HER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

• (Not administered by county)

Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK **Zoning**: **Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

• The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
• Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE**: Approximately 35 records where the STREETTYPE value was still attached to the STREETNAME value (e.g., 'PLANKINTON AV'; 'AURENE CR'; 'PINEBERRY RIDGE'). Take care to ensure removal of STREETTYPE from STREETNAME for STREETTYPE - with standardized domains future data submissions. Some other records were completely missing STREETTYPE values that need to be populated. Move STREETTYPE value to appropriate field and ensure all domains are fully spelled out for records containing these values: CT, DR, DT, LN, LQN, PK, RDAV, RIDG, TERR, TR **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID: Approximately 7 records with values that may need attention (e.g., '1,2,3'; 'LOWR'). Ensure accuracy of values in UNITID field (especially relative to UNITTYPE field) and that there is one single UNITID value for future data submissions. **UNITID ✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE LNDVALUE **✓ IMPVALUE ✓** MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) ▶ ~325 records in the county's V6 submittal - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) **\*** ESTFMKVALUE **✓** NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA **PROPCLASS** – with standardized domains **AUXCLASS**: Per schema specifictions, for publicly owned parcels, the same owner should be designated the same way if they own multiple parcels (e.g., not "CITY OF MILW" and "CITY OF MILWAUKEE," which both occur in the county dataset). In other words, standardize owner names for public parcels to the extent possible for future data submissions. \* AUXCLASS - with standardized domains **ASSDACRES** ✓ DFFD∆CRFS GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted ♦ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names UBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. We appreciate your extra work with work municipalities, so that the county can integrate and submit a complete, comprehensive county parcel dataset. We understand that there are currently logistical obstacles to doing this, but the goal should be for Milwaukee County to eventually submit a completely integrated dataset of the most current finalized tax roll year data for \*all\* of the municipalities in the county. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6\_Final\_Report* and the *V5\_Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

09/15/2020 | Milwaukee | Page 1 of 1

		ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA
	PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
	PARCELID	
	TAXPARCELID	
	PARCELDATE	
<u> </u>	TAXROLLYEAR	
	OWNERNME1	
	OWNERNME2	
	PSTLADRESS	
<u> </u>	SITEADRESS ADDNUMPREFIX	
<u>-</u>	ADDNUM	
1	ADDNUMSUFFIX	
*	PREFIX – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 46 records with directional PREFIX values present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from the PREFIX field ('128 E BADGER DR'; '320 W CAMERON ST'; '2209 S 8TH CT'; '1123 N MARK AVE'). For future data submissions, ensure that PREFIX and all individual address attribute fields are populated where appropriate.</li> <li>Approximately 2 records with value of 'COUNTY HIGHWAY.' The majority of values in the dataset have a value of 'CTH.' Per schema specifications, usage should be consistent throughout the countywide dataset. Do not use multiple highway domain spelling conventions to designate the same particular highway type.</li> </ul>
1	STREETNAME	
<u> </u>	STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
<u> </u>	SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
<u> </u>	LANDMARKNAME	
<u> </u>	UNITTYPE UNITID	
<u>'</u>	PLACENAME	
1	ZIPCODE	
<u> </u>	ZIP4	
	STATE	
	SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
	SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE	
	LNDVALUE	
1	IMPVALUE	
<u>/</u>	MFLVALUE	
*	ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~222 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
	NETPRPTA	
	GRSPRPTA PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
	AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
· •	ASSDACRES	
<u> </u>	DEEDACRES	
	GISACRES	
	CONAME – with standardized domains	
	PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
	-Projection met statewide schema	
	-County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
	—Condo modeling met statewide schema	
	OTHER LAYERS – PLSS	
<u> </u>	PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
	OTHER LAYERS – RML	
	Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	
	JUDITION PACKAGE	

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Oconto County

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** • TAXROLLYEAR: Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. As such, future tax roll year records should be <Null> in all assessment/tax roll fields (i.e., CNTASSDVALUE, LNDVALUE, IMPVALUE, ESTFMKVALUE, NETPRPTA, GRSPRPTA, PROPCLASS, ASSDACRES). Null **\*** TAXROLLYEAR values for records with future tax roll years (~15 records; in AUXCLASS/MFLVALUE fields). **✓ OWNERNME1** OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS: Approximately 1 record with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'PRIVATE CEMETERY OCONTO WI 54153' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing **\*** PSTLADRESS address **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX**: Approximately 2,622 records with PREFIX values present in the SITEADRESS field ('W ARCHIBALD PKWY'; 'E BARKE ST'; 'N BARKMAN ST'; '13770 E RIVERSIDE RD' et cetera) but <Null> in the PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are PREFIX - with standardized domains populated appropriately. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID ✓ PLACENAME** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE **✓ MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE**: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~413 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~37 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NETPRPTA ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES GISACRES CONAME** – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ —Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema HER LAYERS – PL ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK **\* Zoning: Shoreland** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data MISCELLANEOUS

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report.

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

09/15/2020 | Oconto | Page 1 of 1

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	S
PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID ✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2	
/ PSTLADRESS	
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	
ADDNUM	
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
REFIX – with standardized domains	• <b>PREFIX</b> : Approximately 3,152 records with a <null> value in this field but STREETNAME values like 'A', 'P', '32', '45' et cetera. PREFIX values were present in the V5 data. It seems that the highway prefix values were somehow dropped for the V6 submission. Ensure these values are accurately populated for future data submissions.</null>
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
₩ UNITTYPE	<ul> <li>UNITTYPE: Approximately 115 records with abbreviated values like 'APT,' 'BLDG,' 'HNGR,' et cetera which should be fully-spelled out (as called for by the statewide schema and explained in V4_Final_Report).</li> </ul>
✓ UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains  SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
/ LNDVALUE	
/ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
* ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~5,440 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ NETPRPTA	·
✓ GRSPRPTA	
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES	
/ DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
✓ —Projection met statewide schema	
✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS – RML	
✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
* Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names	
SUBMISSION FORM &	
- DIVITORI TI ACMOL	

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 • **PSTLADRESS**: ~13 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. PSTLADRESS SITEADRESS: ~24,971 records with a SITEADRESS value of <Null> and most individual address elements populated for these SITEADRESS same records, which appears to be mostly the City of Appleton. The technical team concatenated the values for these records from the address elements provided. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. SITEADRESS should be fully populated. The county's extra efforts to integrate independent municipal data for the City of Appleton are appreciated! **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: See comment below in STREETNAME. **PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME**: Some values had inaccuracies due to address parsing errors. ~234 records had PREFIX values in the STREETNAME and STREETTYPE fields, and had STREETNAME values in UNITTYPE or SUFFIX fields. - County roads (like 'CTY RD Q') should have a PREFIX value of either "CTH," "COUNTY HIGHWAY," or "COUNTY ROAD" in PREFIX field. **STREETNAME** address 'N4607 COUNTY RD U'▶PREFIX value should be 'COUNTY ROAD', STREETNAME should be 'U' (w/STREETTYPE and UNITTYPE null). UNITITYE INIU. For site address 'N4083 COUNTY RD E A' ▶ PREFIX value should be 'COUNTY ROAD', STREETNAME should be 'E', UNITID should be 'A' (w/STREETTYPE and SUFFIX null). Ensure accuracy of values in each individual address element field. **STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains SUFFIX - with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** There are UNITTYPE errors on this report UNITID which have reoccurred. The county will be asked to certify **✓ PLACENAME** that these issues will be rectified **✓** ZIPCODE prior to the next submission on ✓ ZIP4 the grant application. **✓** STATE If flagged errors are observed in ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains the future, the county's data ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains will not be assessed **CNTASSDVALUE** until it is free from LNDVALUE annually repeated **✓** IMPVALUE errors. ✓ MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE** ✓ NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains **AUXCLASS** – with standardized domains **ASSDACRES** DEEDACRES GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Other Layers - with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  The dataset submitted had instances of values of <Null> erroneously provided as a string. Populate null fields with a true SQL <Null> for future data submissions. Running the Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) prior to submitting data can help you correct these instances.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### HER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Not administered by county)
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. **Zoning**: **Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 **✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX** ADDNUM: Approximately 1 record with a value of '408 A & B.' This value contains UNITID values still attached to the **ADDNUM** ADDNUM. Move this value to UNITID field for future data submissions. **ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX**: Approximately 223 records with a directional prefix value of "N," "S," "E," or "W" present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. PREFIX - with standardized domains STREETNAME: Approximately 1 record with value of 'SAND ROAD' that still had a STREETTYPE attached. Move this value **STREETNAME** ('ROAD') to the STREETTYPE field. STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID**: Approximately 2 records with values that are not true UNITID values like '(KRAEMER)', and also contain UNITTYPE values. Ensure all values are in the appropriate attribute fields for future data submission. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE MFLVALUE: In initial data submission, approximately 935 records with <Null> values for MFLVALUE, despite indication they were parcels enrolled in the Managed Forest Law or Forest Crop Law program (by presence of AUXCLASS values of 'W1-W8') **\*** MFLVALUE Ensure accuracy of MFLVALUE field for future data submissions. • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **#** FSTFMKVALUE Value, However, Solite Special cases where the field of STMRVALUE does not apply freed to be fidiled. As schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ~79 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ~6 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NETPRPTA **GRSPRPTA** PROPCLASS: Approximately 187 records with PROPCLASS or AUXCLASS fields missing values. For future data submissions, please somehow address records where neither PROPCLASS nor AUXCLASS values are populated in tax roll (perhaps by way PROPCLASS – with standardized domains of the Explain-Certification potion of submission form). AUXCLASS: See comment above in PROPCLASS. **\* AUXCLASS** – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PL ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ♦ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

# MISCELLANEOUS

• The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

Great improvement again this year, Pepin County! Thank you for working to significantly reduce the number of errors in the V6 submission.

Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Pierce County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE PARCELDATE: Approximately 3,164 records contain timestamp attached to the end of values. Remove timestamp from this field for future data submissions. TAXROLLYEAR **OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS**: Approximately 188 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as ', ', ' ELMWOOD, WI 54740'; ' MADISON, WI '; ' SPRING VALLEY, WI 54767' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels **\*** PSTLADRESS without a \*complete\* mailing address. SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST - with standardized domains **SCHOOLDISTNO** – with standardized domains **CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓ IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE** ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **✓ NETPRPTA** ✓ GRSPRPTA **PROPCLASS** – with standardized domains **AUXCLASS** – with standardized domains ASSDACRES DEEDACRES GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains ✓ —Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

#### OTHER LAYERS – RML

\* Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

Zoning layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a **DESCRIPTION** of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a **LINK** to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "https://www.co.pierce.wi.us/Land%20Management/PDF%20Forms/Zoning%20Districts.pdf." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future data submissions.

- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

#### BMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE • UNITTYPE: Approximately 1 record with a value of 'STE.' Please spell out to 'SUITE' for all future data submissions UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE value, however, some special cases where the field 23TMNVALDE does not apply schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~41 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NFTPRPTA GRSPRPTA **\* PROPCLASS** – with standardized domains PROPCLASS: For future data submissions, please somehow address records where neither PROPCLASS nor AUXCLASS values are populated in tax roll (perhaps by way of the Explain-Certification potion of submission form). **\* AUXCLASS** – with standardized domains AUXCLASS: See comment above in PROPCLASS. ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6 Final Report* and the *V5 Final Report*. There are numerous users of the standardized format. the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Portage County

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
* TAXROLLYEAR	<ul> <li>TAXROLLYEAR: Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. As such, future tax roll year records should be <null> in all assessment/tax roll fields (i.e., CNTASSDVALUE, LNDVALUE, IMPVALUE, ESTFMKVALUE, NETPRPTA, GRSPRPTA, PROPCLASS, ASSDACRES). Null values for records with future tax roll years (~450 records; in ESTFMKVALUE/NETPRPTA/GRSPRPTA/ASSDACRES fields).</null></li> </ul>
✓ OWNERNME1	
✓ OWNERNME2	
* PSTLADRESS	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 14 records w/ values like 'DECEASED'; 'AMERICA'; 'PUBLIC &amp; SPECIAL BENEFITS' et cetera.         Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records in future submissions by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing address.</null></li> </ul>
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	
✓ ADDNUM	
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ STREETNAME	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE	
✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
* SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	SCHOOLDIST: Approximately 367 records with a valid tayroll year (2019), but no values in either SCHOOLDIST or
* SCHOOLDIST - With Standardized domains	• SCHOOLDIST: Approximately 367 records with a valid taxroll year (2019), but no values in either SCHOOLDIST or SCHOOLDISTNO fields. Please ensure these values are populated for all valid tax parcels for future data submissions.
* SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	• SCHOOLDISTNO: See comment above in SCHOOLDIST.
✓ CNTASSDVALUE	
✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
✓ ESTFMKVALUE	
✓ NETPRPTA	
✓ GRSPRPTA	
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ ASSDACRES	
✓ DEEDACRES	
✓ GISACRES	
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
Projection mot statewide scheme	
<ul> <li>✓ —Projection met statewide schema</li> <li>✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)</li> </ul>	
✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS – RML	
✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
✓ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names	
SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### HER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- \* Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK · Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available. **\* Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE** TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS: Approximately 5 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'ADDRESS UNKNOWN,, '; 'SHOOP PARK, ,.' Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. PSTLADRESS **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX** ADDNUM: Approximately 233 records where submitted values for ADDNUM and ADDNUMSUFFIX were <Null>, but were present in SITEADRESS field (for SITEADRESS = '142A RIVERSIDE DR'; '18426A DURAND AVE'; '4242-5 TAYLOR HARBOR E'; but ADDNUM and ADDNUMSUFFIX were <Null>). Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated where **ADDNUM** ADDNUMSUFFIX: See comment in ADDNUM above. **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETNAME: Approximately 1 record erroneously had a value of 'ST' in the STREETNAME field instead of being in the STREETTYPE field where it belongs, and also missing STREETNAME value of '76TH' (for SITEADRESS = '76TH ST S' STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES ✓** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema HER LAYERS – PI ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK \* Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.

- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  The dataset submitted had instances of values of <Null> erroneously provided as a string. Populate null fields with a true SQL <Null> for future data submissions. Running the Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) prior to submitting data can help you correct these instances.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Richland County

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE PARCELDATE: All record with a value of '01000101.' The standardized format for this field is 'MM/DD/YYYY.' If a value for the date of last geometric edit is not known, enter a true SQL <Null> for these records for future data submissions. TAXROLLYEAR **OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS**: Approximately 1 record with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip (for record containing 'WILLOW'). Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing. **\*** PSTLADRESS **✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE**: Approximately 1 record with value of 'NORTH.' Per the location in the SITEADRESS field ('HWY 80 N'), this value belongs in the SUFFIX field. Move values from STREETTYPE to SUFFIX field and ensure accurate parsing and placement STREETTYPE – with standardized domains of individual address elements into their respective fields for future data submissions. **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID PLACENAME ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ➤ ~327 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ➤ ~7 records in the county's V6 submittal **\*** ESTFMKVALUE **✓ NETPRPTA** ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **ASSDACRES ✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) -Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PI PLSS - PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK **Zoning: Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE**

- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## OTHER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- (Not administered by county)
- Shoreland layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a clear DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "https://www.co.rock.wi.us/planning-ordinance-administration." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records prior to submitting for future data submissions
- ♦ **Zoning**: **Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

#### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA FEATURE CLASS **✓** PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE **TAXROLLYEAR**: Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. As such, future tax roll year records should be <Null> in all assessment/tax roll fields. Null values for records with future tax roll years (~12 records; in CNTASSDVALUE/LNDVALUE/PROPCLASS/ASSDACRES/IMPVALUE/NETPRPTA/GRSPRPTA fields). **\*** TAXROLLYEAR ✓ OWNERNME1 **OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX** ADDNUMPREFIX: ~1 record with value of 'UNASSIGNE.' < Null> out values which are not true address numbers. **ADDNUM** • ADDNUM: ~1 record with value of 'D.' < Null> out values which are not true address numbers. **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: ~1,894 records with highway PREFIX values present in the SITEADRESS field, but not present in PREFIX field. Ensure PREFIX - with standardized domains that PRETIX values are accurate and populated appropriately for future data submissions. This issue was also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. ~ 1,243 records with a directional prefix value present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field—such as '505 E 3RD ST S'; '720 W ARTHUR AVE RD'; '217 S COLEMAN ST'; 'W8526 W FLAMBEAU AVE' et cetera. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. ~ 1 record with value of the street name in the PREFIX field (for SITEADRESS of 'W3602 E & M DR'). Remove 'E' from PREFIX field and populate STREETNAME with the value 'E & M'. STREETNAME: ~1 record with values of 'SHOULDER RD' that still had the street type value attached. Move the street type value ('ROAD') to the STREETTYPE field and spell out. **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains LANDMARKNAME UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 STATE **SCHOOLDIST**: All records erroneously have values of school district number ('0735', '5757' etcetera) in SCHOOLDIST field instead of in the SCHOOLDISTNO field where they belong and vice versa ('BRUCE SCHOOL DISTRICT', 'FLAMBEAU SCHOOL DISTRICT' et cetera are present in SCHOOLDISTNO field). Ensure accuracy of all school district values for future submissions. **\* SCHOOLDIST** – with standardized domains **\* SCHOOLDISTNO** – with standardized domains SCHOOLDISTNO: See comment above in SCHOOLDIST **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~19 records in the county's V6 submittal **\*** ESTFMKVALUE NETPRPTA: In initial data submission, values for NETPRPTA (Net Property Tax) and GRSPRPTA (Gross Property Tax) were '0' or <Null> for all records in the dataset. Either NETPRPTA or GRSPRPTA is required and should be populated as appropriate. **₩** NFTPRPTA PROPCLASS – with standardized domains There are ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains errors on this report ASSDACRES which have reoccurred. The county will be asked to certify **✓ DEEDACRES** that these issues will be rectified GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains prior to the next submission on ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains the grant application. If flagged errors are observed in ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains the future, the county's data -Projection met statewide schema will not be assessed ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) until it is free from ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema annually repeated OTHER LAYERS – PI errors. ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ♦ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGI ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications. Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time. Error flag numbers in the Validation Tool were inflated due to the presence of string values of '<Null>', blanks, and string values in lower case letters. In the future, running the *Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool* (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) prior to submitting data may be required to help you correct these instances prior to uploading your data. Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6\_Final\_Report* and the *V5\_Final\_Report*. There are numerous users of the other testimonials in the forthcoming the averaged layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### HER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- \* Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

\* Provided .ini submission form + data

• SUBMISSION PACKAGE: The geodatabase initially submitted along with the other layers were from last year's V5 submission. For future data submissions, please verify that the package includes current information before uploading.

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 • PSTLADRESS: Approximately 10 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as 'ELAND, WI 54427-0000'; 'GREEN VALLEY, WI 54127-0000'; 'GRESHAM, WI 54128-0000' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. Great improvement since V5, but as this issue was also noted on a PSTLADRESS previous year's Observation Report, please continue to pay attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission. SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: Approximately 4,948 records with a directional prefix value of "N," "S," "E," or "W" present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field—such as '122 N SAWYER ST'; '100 W MAIN ST'; '910 E ZINGLER AVE'; '817 S WASHINGTON ST **PREFIX** – with standardized domains et cetera. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. STREETNAME: Approximately 28 records with the part of street name ('ST JOHNS CHURCH,' 'ST AGUSTINE') value of 'ST' **STREETNAME** (which should be for 'Saint') mistakenly spelled out and set as the PREFIX value of 'STH.' Please pay attention to ensuring accuracy of these atypical street names for future data submissions. **STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains LANDMARKNAME UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE ✓ IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE NETPRPTA** ✓ GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PI ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	
✓ PARCELID	
✓ TAXPARCELID	
✓ PARCELDATE	
✓ TAXROLLYEAR	
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
✓ PSTLADRESS	
✓ SITEADRESS	
✓ ADDNUMPREFIX	• ADDNUM: Approximately 2 records where submitted values for ADDNUM and ADDNUMSUFFIX were <null>, but were</null>
* ADDNUM	erroneously placed attached together in ADDNUMPREFIX field and were present in SITEADRESS field ('1109E ASPEN CT':
	'1116E ASPEN CT'). Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated accurately and where appropriate.
✓ ADDNUMSUFFIX	
✓ PREFIX – with standardized domains	
STREETNAME  CTPETTYPE with standardined decreins	
✓ STREETTYPE – with standardized domains ✓ SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
✓ LANDMARKNAME	
✓ UNITTYPE	
✓ UNITID	
✓ PLACENAME	
✓ ZIPCODE	
✓ ZIP4	
✓ STATE	
✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
* CNTASSDVALUE	<ul> <li>CNTASSDVALUE: There were approximately 507 records had PROPCLASS values of 1 or 3 (indicating residential or manufacturing properties), and a CNTASSDVALUE value of '0.' The county's submission form stated, "Sheboygan County Real Property Listing will need to work with local assessors to correct this." Your efforts to resolve this issue for future data submissions will be appreciated.</li> </ul>
✓ LNDVALUE	
✓ IMPVALUE	
✓ MFLVALUE	
* ESTFMKVALUE	• ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS WI-W9) ▶ ~54 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4)
✓ NETPRPTA	
✓ GRSPRPTA	
✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
✓ ASSDACRES	
✓ DEEDACRES	
✓ GISACRES	
✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
✓ —Projection met statewide schema	
✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)	
✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
OTHER LAYERS - PLSS	
✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted	
OTHER LAYERS – RML	
★ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK     ★ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	<ul> <li>(Not administered by county)</li> <li>Shoreland layer was missing the required DESCRIPTION and/or LINK information. Zoning layers must include either: a) a field with a DESCRIPTION of the class name for each zoning feature, or b) a field or metadata populated with a LINK to a valid webpage or web document that contains authoritative descriptions of the specific zoning class or all zoning classes within the jurisdiction. For all records, a LINK field was populated with "https://www.sheboygancounty.com/home/showdocument?id=10672." Ensure either DESCRIPTION or LINK exists and is populated for all records for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>▶ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK</li> <li>✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names</li> </ul>	• (Not administered by county)
SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE	
✓ Provided .ini submission form + data	

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
 Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
 Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 **✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX**: Approximately 11 records with ADDNUMSUFFIX present in SITEADRESS field, but address number suffix appears to be erroneously missing from individual ADDNUMSUFFIX field (SITEADRESS = '232 A N 2ND ST', '1312 A 146TH AVE', '1312 B 146TH AVE'). Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated where appropriate for future data **ADDNUMSUFFIX** PREFIX: Approximately 50 records missing directional PREFIX values (based on values in SITEADRESS field). For some, the alpha characters might have mistakenly been added to the ADDNUMSUFFIX field. "N," "S," "E," or "W" values belong in the PREFIX field—such as '769 E YELLOWSTONE DR'; '327 A N 3RD ST LOWER APT'; '560 S MAPLE'; '316 W SPRING ST' et cetera. PREFIX should be populated appropriately for these records. Consult Submission Documentation for guidance on prefix values. PREFIX - with standardized domains STREETNAME STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX**: Approximately 90 records missing SUFFIX values, based on values in the SITEADRESS field. Populate the SUFFIX field with the values "N," "S," "F," or "W" for all records where such suffix values are present in the SITEADRESS. This issue was also **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next data submission. LANDMARKNAME UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE SCHOOLDIST - with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MELVALUE **\*** ESTFMKVALUE ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ✓ NETPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES ✓** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) **Zoning**: **Airport protection** – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Taylor County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA PARCELID **TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX**: Approximately 77 records with a directional prefix value of "N," "S," "E," or "W" present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing from PREFIX field—such as '1073 W CEDAR ST'; '948 N SECOND ST'; 'W4901 N CHELSEA AVE' et cetera. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions. **PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID** PLACENAME ✓ ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE IMPVALUE** MFLVALUE **✓ ESTFMKVALUE ✓** NETPRPTA **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓** DEEDACRES GISACRES CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### OTHER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

#### OTHER LAYERS – RML

- Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **\* Zoning: Shoreland** with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- \* Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.

(Not administered by county)

✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names

#### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of
- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

rsion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database	Project OBSERVATION REPORT <b>Trempealeau County</b>
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA &
PARCEL FEATURE CLASWITH TAX ROLL DATA	SS
PARCELID	<ul> <li>PARCELID: All records had PARCELID missing, with values erroneously present in the TAXPARCELID field ('00200010000'; '002005940000' et cetera). In previous years, the county's PARCELID contained these values, whereas the TAXPARCELID field held a version with hyphens (e.g., '002-0001-0000'; '002-00816-0000'; '002-00594-0000'). Please note and ensure the required PARCELID field is populated for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
TAXPARCELID	
PARCELDATE	
TAXROLLYEAR	
OWNERNME1	
OWNERNME2	
PSTLADRESS	
SITEADRESS	
ADDNUMPREFIX	
ADDNUM	ADDNIMACHERY. A paravigrataly 161 records with values of "M" (C. 'N) "E. Those values surrouths within the DDELY
ADDNUMSUFFIX	<ul> <li>ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 161 records with values of 'W', 'S', 'N', 'E.' These values currently exist within the PREFIX field, as they should. Remove these duplicate values from ADDNUMSUFFIX field.</li> <li>Approximately 1 record with ADDNUMSUFFIX value missing, but present in SITEADRESS field ('134 1/2 W MAIN ST APT 1'). Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated where appropriate for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
PREFIX – with standardized domains	<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 2,107 records with a directional prefix value of "N," "S," "E," or "W" present in the SITEADRESS field, but missing a corresponding value in the PREFIX field. Ensure that PREFIX values are populated appropriately for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
STREETNAME	<ul> <li>STREETNAME: Approximately 190 records with PREFIX value of 'CTH' and STREETNAME = 'SOUTH,' 'NORTH,' 'WEST,' or 'EAST.' These are *not* directionals and thus should not be spelled out. Correct these highway street name values and ensure the accuracy of STREETNAME values for future data submissions.</li> </ul>
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
LANDMARKNAME	
UNITTYPE UNITID	
PLACENAME	
ZIPCODE	
ZIP4	
STATE	
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
CNTASSDVALUE	
LNDVALUE	
IMPVALUE	
MFLVALUE	
ESTFMKVALUE	<ul> <li>ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:         <ul> <li>Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)</li> <li>Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ➤ ~192 records in the county's V6 submittal</li> <li>Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ➤ ~18 records in the county's V6 submittal</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
NETPRPTA	
GRSPRPTA	
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
ASSDACRES	
DEEDACRES	
GISACRES	
CONAME – with standardized domains	
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
—Projection met statewide schema	

- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

# OTHER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

\* Provided .ini submission form + data

• SUBMISSION PACKAGE: The geodatabase initially submitted was empty. Please verify that ALL information is complete and included before uploading.

• The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
• Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 OWNERNME2 • **PSTLADRESS**: Approximately 61 records with partial mailing address values containing only city, state, and zip—such as ', CHASEBURG, WI, 54621'; ', DESOTO, WI, 54624'; ', VIROQUA, WI, 54665' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter <Null> for parcels without a \*complete\* mailing address. **\* PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX** ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 8 records with values of 'N', 'S', or 'W.' Per their location in the SITEADRESS field, these values belong in the PREFIX field • PREFIX: See comment above in ADDNUMSUFFIX. PREFIX - with standardized domains **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains SUFFIX - with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST - with standardized domains **SCHOOLDISTNO** – with standardized domains **CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓ IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE** ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **✓ NETPRPTA** ✓ GRSPRPTA **PROPCLASS** – with standardized domains **AUXCLASS** – with standardized domains ASSDACRES DEEDACRES GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema # —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) County parcel fabric contains gaps -Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PI ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ♦ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)

- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

#### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
- Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Vilas County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS ✓** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME**: Approximately 3 records with values requiring attention. The records had a street type abbreviation still attached to the street name, such as 'BEACHWOOD DR'; 'SILVER BIRCH RD'; 'SUGAR MAPLE VILLAGE RD' et cetera. Remove street STREETTYPE and move to the correct field. For future data submissions, ensure accuracy of STREETNAME and that **STREETNAME** associated address attribute fields are accurately populated. STREETTYPE – with standardized domains STREETTYPE: See comment above in STREETNAME **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID **✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE ✓ MFLVALUE ✓ ESTFMKVALUE **NETPRPTA** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema ER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK

- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 **✓ PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS ADDNUMPREFIX: Approximately 1 record with ADDNUMPREFIX present in SITEADRESS field, but address number suffix appears to be erroneously missing from individual ADDNUMPREFIX field (SITEADRESS = 'N2641 SOUTH RD'). Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are populated where appropriate for future data submissions. **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM** • ADDNUMSUFFIX: Approximately 106 instances of the string '<Null>' exists in ADDNUMSUFFIX field. Running the **ADDNUMSUFFIX** Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) can help you correct these instances. Be sure to include '<Null>' in the list of values to be replaced with a true SQL <Null>. **PREFIX**: Approximately 9 records where value for PREFIX was present in SITEADRESS field ('100 E COMMERCE CT'; '345 S LAKESHORE DR UNIT 104'), but missing from PREFIX field. Ensure that all individual address attribute fields are accurately PREFIX - with standardized domains populated. **STREETNAME STREETTYPE** – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE **UNITID ✓ PLACENAME ✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST - with standardized domains SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE MFLVALUE • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the **\*** ESTFMKVALUE schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~37 records in the county's V6 submittal Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ✓ NETPRPTA GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES ✓** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains PARCELFIPS - with standardized domains PARCELSRC - with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML ♦ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county) ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE Provided .ini submission form + data MISCELLANEOUS

• The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
• Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
• Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

## HER LAYERS – PLSS

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- \* Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK • Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
- Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
   Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5 Final Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- **PARCELID**
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2 ✓ PSTLADRESS**
- SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- GRSPRPTA
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

### **ER LAYERS – PLSS**

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- ♦ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V7-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  The dataset submitted had instances of values of <Null> erroneously provided as a string. Populate null fields with a true SQL <Null> for future data submissions. Running the Null Fields and Set to UPPERCASE Tool (www.sco.wisc.edu/parcels/tools) prior to submitting data can help you correct these instances.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statution parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the counts's data-available in a standardized format!

- the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID PARCELDATE ✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 PSTLADRESS SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains PREFIX: Approximately 2 records with a PREFIX value of 'N' present in the SITEADRESS field, but prefix was omitted from this individual element field. Ensure that PREFIX values are present in individual address element field for future data submissions **STREETNAME**: Approximately 3 records with values like 'WOODLAND WONDERLAND CT' where the street type value is still attached to the street name, and is redundant (because the value of 'COURT' already exists in the STREETTYPE field). Remove all street type values from the STREETNAME field and ensure that address attribute fields are populated accurately. **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE - with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE ✓ ZIP4 **✓** STATE SCHOOLDIST - with standardized domains SCHOOLDISTNO - with standardized domains ✓ CNTASSDVALUE **✓ LNDVALUE ✓ IMPVALUE MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE**: In initial submission—in the City of New Berlin, City of Waukesha and City of Brookfield—there were approximately 51,432 records containing PROPCLASS 1,2,3,6 and 7 where a value for ESTFMKVALUE was expected, but contained values of '0'. Records with these classes of property are taxable and expected to have values. This was resolved upon re-submit. Thank you for verifying that all information is integrated for future data submissions. The county's extra **\*** ESTFMKVALUE effort to integrate municipal data is appreciated. The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE does not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out Some special cases where the little LSTH MYALDE does not apply need to be holded. As called for by the ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially: - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M) - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) ▶ ~27 records in the county's V6 submittal - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) ▶ ~30 records in the county's V6 submittal ✓ NFTPRPTA GRSPRPTA **PROPCLASS** – with standardized domains AUXCLASS - with standardized domains ASSDACRES DEEDACRES **✓** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELSRC – with standardized domains -Projection met statewide schema -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema OTHER LAYERS – PLSS ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted OTHER LAYERS – RML ✓ Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ✓ Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK ♦ Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted) ✓ Other Layers – with standardized file names SUBMISSION FORM & ✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

• The comments provided in this *V6 Observation Report* describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the *V1-V5 Observation Reports*—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming *V6 Final Report* and the *V5 Final Report*. There are numerous users of

the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

	ODCEDVATION DEDOCT MA	
ersion 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Waupaca County		
	ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA	
DARCEL FEATURE CLASS		
PARCEL FEATURE CLASS		
PARCELID		
TAXPARCELID		
PARCELDATE		
✓ TAXROLLYEAR		
OWNERNME1		
OWNERNME2		
PSTLADRESS	<ul> <li>PSTLADRESS: Approximately 46 records with incomplete PSTLADRESS values like 'MADISON WI 0'; 'MADISON WI 537070000'; 'WAUPACA WI 549810000' et cetera. Mailing address values should not be incomplete. Clean these records by entering a complete mailing address in the PSTLADRESS field, or enter a true SQL <null> for parcels without a *complete* mailing address.</null></li> </ul>	
SITEADRESS		
ADDNUMPREFIX		
ADDNUM		
ADDNUMSUFFIX		
PREFIX – with standardized domains		
STREETNAME		
STREETTYPE – with standardized domains		
SUFFIX – with standardized domains		
LANDMARKNAME		
<b>♥</b> UNITTYPE	<ul> <li>UNITTYPE: Approximately 1 record with UNITTYPE value of 'BUILDING 1 APARTMENT,' which is not in the acceptable domain list. Please standardize unit type domains for future data submissions.</li> </ul>	
UNITID		
PLACENAME		
ZIPCODE		
ZIP4		
STATE		
SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains		
SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains		
CNTASSDVALUE  LNDVALUE		
/ IMPVALUE		
/ MFLVALUE		
✓ ESTFMKVALUE		
NETPRPTA		
✓ GRSPRPTA		
PROPCLASS – with standardized domains		
AUXCLASS – with standardized domains		
/ ASSDACRES		
/ DEEDACRES		
/ GISACRES		
CONAME – with standardized domains		
PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains		
PARCELORG with standardized domains		

- PARCELSRC with standardized domains
- ✓ —Projection met statewide schema
- -County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- -Condo modeling met statewide schema

**\* PLSS** – PLSS corner data was submitted

PLSS: According to WLIP records, the county received Strategic Initiative grant funding to work toward achieving Benchmark #4 Completion and Integration of PLSS (for the years 2016-2017, 2019). According to the Benchmark #4 requirement, all PLSS corner coordinate values established using Strategic Initiative funds should be tagged with their appropriate accuracy class (Survey Grade, Sub-meter, or Approximate). Therefore, we expected to see the "horiz\_accuracy" field populated. Please make sure to populate for future submissions.

## **OTHER LAYERS – RML**

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Not administered by county)
- ✓ Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM & PACKAGE

✓ Provided .ini submission form + data

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the
- datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

		ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA V
	PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA	5
✓	PARCELID	
	TAXPARCELID	
	PARCELDATE	TANDOLINEAD D. L. SIL HC e. H. L. STANDOLINEAD
赤	TAXROLLYEAR	<ul> <li>TAXROLLYEAR: Parcels with a "future" value in TAXROLLYEAR are given these values to show that they lack tax roll data because they have not yet been assessed. Future tax roll year records should be <null> in all assessment/tax roll fields (i.e., CNTASSDVALUE, LNDVALUE, IMPVALUE, ESTFMKVALUE, NETPRPTA, GRSPRPTA, PROPCLASS, ASSDACRES). Null values for records with future tax roll years (~237 records; in CNTASSDVALUE/PROPCLASS/IMPVALUE/LNDVALUE/ASSDACRES).</null></li> </ul>
<b>✓</b>	OWNERNME1	
✓	OWNERNME2	
	PSTLADRESS	
-	SITEADRESS	
<u> </u>	ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM	
<u>*</u>	ADDNUMSUFFIX	
*		<ul> <li>PREFIX: Approximately 2,297 records missing a prefix directional value in PREFIX, but directional values ("N," "S," "E," or "W") present in the SITEADRESS field. For future data submissions, ensure that PREFIX and all individual address attribute fields are populated where appropriate.</li> <li>In general, county roads (like 'CTY RD A') should have a PREFIX value of either "CTH," "COUNTY HIGHWAY," or "COUNTY ROAD" in the PREFIX field.</li> </ul>
0	STREETNAME	• STREETNAME: ~1 record with PREFIX value attached ('COUNTY ROAD A'). Move prefix value of 'CTH' to PREFIX field. • Approximately 411 records with values of 'NORTH,' 'SOUTH,' 'EAST,' or 'WEST' and PREFIX values of 'CTH,' indicating county highways. For these records, the STREETNAME values should not be spelled out. Ensure the accuracy of STREETNAME values and careful parsing of individual address elements. Similar issues were also noted on a previous year's Observation Report. Please pay particular attention to resolving this prior to the next annual data submission.
<b>✓</b>	STREETTYPE – with standardized domains	
✓	SUFFIX – with standardized domains	
<b>\</b>	LANDMARKNAME	
<u> </u>	UNITTYPE	
<u>/</u>	UNITID PLACENAME	
	ZIPCODE	
	ZIP4	
	STATE	
<b>✓</b>	SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains	
✓	SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains	
	CNTASSDVALUE	
	LNDVALUE	
	IMPVALUE MFLVALUE	• MFLVALUE: In initial data submission, approximately 1,814 records with <null> values for MFLVALUE, despite indication</null>
į	ESTFMKVALUE	they were parcels enrolled in the Managed Forest Law or Forest Crop Law program (by presence of AUXCLASS values of 'W1 W8'). Ensure accuracy of MFLVALUE field for future data submissions.  • ESTFMKVALUE: The Estimated Fair Market Value field was accurately populated for taxable parcels assessed at full market
		value, however, some special cases where the field ESTFMKVALUE doe's not apply need to be nulled. As called for by the schema, null out ESTFMKVALUE for parcels that are wholly or partially:  - Assessed at use value or 50% of market value (PROPCLASS 4, 5, or 5M)  - Enrolled in MFL/FCL programs (AUXCLASS W1-W9) > ~393 records in the county's V6 submittal  - Tax exempt (AUXCLASS X1-X4) > ~18 records in the county's V6 submittal
	NETPRPTA	
	GRSPRPTA PROPCLASS – with standardized domains	
	AUXCLASS – with standardized domains	
	ASSDACRES	
<b>/</b>	DEEDACRES	
<b>/</b>	GISACRES	
<b>✓</b>	<b>CONAME</b> – with standardized domains	
	PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains	
	PARCELSRC – with standardized domains	
	-Projection met statewide schema	
	—County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)     —Condo modeling met statewide schema	
_	OTHER LAYERS – PLSS	
<b>/</b>	PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted  OTHER LAYERS – RML	
_	Zoning: County general – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	
	Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK  Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	Work toward zoning GIS layer and submit when one becomes available.
	Zoning: Airport protection – with DESCRIPTION/LINK	(Not administered by county)
	Other Layers – with standardized file names	( · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	SUBMISSION FORM &	

The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

#### Version 6 Statewide Parcel Map Database Project OBSERVATION REPORT Winnebago County ACTION REQUIRED TO MEET STATEWIDE SCHEMA PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA **PARCELID TAXPARCELID** PARCELDATE **✓ TAXROLLYEAR** ✓ OWNERNME1 ✓ OWNERNME2 **✓ PSTLADRESS** SITEADRESS **ADDNUMPREFIX ADDNUM ADDNUMSUFFIX PREFIX** – with standardized domains **STREETNAME** STREETTYPE – with standardized domains **SUFFIX** – with standardized domains **LANDMARKNAME** UNITTYPE UNITID ✓ PLACENAME **✓** ZIPCODE **✓** ZIP4 STATE ✓ SCHOOLDIST – with standardized domains ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO – with standardized domains **✓ CNTASSDVALUE ✓ LNDVALUE ✓** IMPVALUE **✓ MFLVALUE ESTFMKVALUE NETPRPTA**: In initial data submission—for the City of Oshkosh—NETPRPTA and GRSPRPTA values were missing for about 21,192 records. Either Net Property Tax or Gross Property Tax values were expected for these records (based on property class values). This was resolved with the submission of a joinable table. Thank you for verifying that all information is NETPRPTA integrated for future data submissions. The county's extra effort to integrate municipal data is appreciated. **✓** GRSPRPTA ✓ PROPCLASS – with standardized domains ✓ AUXCLASS – with standardized domains **✓** ASSDACRES **✓ DEEDACRES** GISACRES ✓ CONAME – with standardized domains ✓ PARCELFIPS – with standardized domains **PARCELSRC** – with standardized domains Projection met statewide schema ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps) ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema **ER LAYERS – PLSS** ✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted HER LAYERS – RML

- ✓ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- ✓ Zoning: Shoreland with DESCRIPTION/LINK
- Zoning: Airport protection with DESCRIPTION/LINK (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

### SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.

  Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.

  Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!

# PARCEL FEATURE CLASS WITH TAX ROLL DATA

- PARCELID
- **TAXPARCELID**
- PARCELDATE
- **✓ TAXROLLYEAR**
- ✓ OWNERNME1
- **✓ OWNERNME2**
- **✓ PSTLADRESS**
- **✓** SITEADRESS
- **ADDNUMPREFIX**
- **ADDNUM**
- **ADDNUMSUFFIX**
- **PREFIX** with standardized domains
- **STREETNAME**
- STREETTYPE with standardized domains
- **SUFFIX** with standardized domains
- **LANDMARKNAME**
- UNITTYPE
- UNITID
- ✓ PLACENAME
- **✓** ZIPCODE
- **✓** ZIP4
- STATE
- ✓ SCHOOLDIST with standardized domains
- ✓ SCHOOLDISTNO with standardized domains
- **✓ CNTASSDVALUE**
- **✓ LNDVALUE**
- **✓** IMPVALUE
- **✓ MFLVALUE**
- ✓ ESTFMKVALUE
- **NETPRPTA**
- **GRSPRPTA**
- ✓ PROPCLASS with standardized domains
- ✓ AUXCLASS with standardized domains
- **✓** ASSDACRES
- **✓ DEEDACRES**
- **✓** GISACRES
- ✓ CONAME with standardized domains
- ✓ PARCELFIPS with standardized domains
- **PARCELSRC** with standardized domains
- -Projection met statewide schema
- ✓ —County parcel fabric was complete (lacked gaps)
- ✓ —Condo modeling met statewide schema

#### **ER LAYERS – PLSS**

✓ PLSS – PLSS corner data was submitted

## HER LAYERS – RML

- ♦ Zoning: County general with DESCRIPTION/LINK
  - (Not administered by county) Zoning: Shoreland – with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Not administered by county)
- **Zoning: Airport protection** with DESCRIPTION/LINK • (Unchanged from previous year, not submitted)
- Other Layers with standardized file names

# SUBMISSION FORM &

- The comments provided in this V6 Observation Report describe deviations from the statewide schema that require your attention. In order for your county to meet the Searchable Format requirement listed under state statue 59.72(2)(a), you will need to make the corrections noted on this report—as well as the V1-V5 Observation Reports—and ensure that the datasets submitted in the future exactly match DOA's schema specifications.
   Feedback on the annual parcel data submission process is welcome to DOA/SCO at any time.
- Excellent work! You met the Searchable Format without any significant deviations from the statewide schema.
- Thanks for your work to prepare your data submission. You can read end-user testimonials in the forthcoming V6\_Final\_Report and the V5\_Final\_Report. There are numerous users of the statewide parcel layer who appreciate your efforts to make the county's data available in a standardized format!