

BenNevis presentation on 2-7-02 9:30

Attendees: David Claypool, Bert Black, Denny Kron, Jeff Carlson, Bill Mori, Angie Burrs, Bob Horton, Betty Elkington (intern), Charlie Carpenter (BenNevis), Keith Schider (BenNevis), Pam Trombo (BenNevis) Beth McInerny, Paul Backus (BenNevis), Mary Manville (BenNevis), Mark Monacelli (via phone)

The purpose of the meeting is to review and provide some feedback on the initial results of the surveys now underway. This will also help establish a process for on-going communication between BenNevis and the Task Force. We will provide a report of this meeting to the Task Force. Subsequent meetings with BenNevis will be scheduled to facilitate the interpretation of survey results and the development of standards.

There was a discussion about what standards and products should result from this initiative. The following are a few of the ideas expressed:

- Standards that allow for communication of data between the public and private sectors
- Rules around that communication which include transferring data between both parties
- Principles around access
- Standards that allow counties to perform their processes in regard to current lifecycle needs
- Standards that allow for searching this data after the fact and for historical storage

BenNevis reported confusion regarding the tract index and its status in MN recordings. It was agreed that when evaluating counties an emphasis should be placed on the idea that a tract index will be a standard in all MN counties. The Legal Subcommittee is tackling the issue of making the tract the official index in MN. The majority of counties have this already.

BenNevis will be comparing interview results against a matrix reflecting the 37 considerations in the Workplan.

Cost information collected in interviews will be costs associated with process and full time employee costs, not hardware or software costs. It was agreed that these costs (hw and sw) are too difficult to accurately identify and that in attempts to define costs in the past the results were confusing and could be misleading. Instead BenNevis should concentrate on the general costs associated with upgrading /enhancing hardware and software to meet e-recording.

Focus on a working pilot. Scope of transactions will be narrowed to accommodate a working pilot.

BenNevis asked for additional clarification on these considerations in the TF Workplan :

4. Consider inventorying the major categories of land-related records that counties currently maintain, include, for example, zoning maps, building permit files, wetland and other natural resource inventories, and property tax records. Agreed strategy for BenNevis to follow: Focus on the real estate transaction aspect of inventorying. GIS though is involved in retrieval so it does get included. Concentrate on processes or transactions which have an effect on real estate processing in terms of rejection and review needs. These inventory pieces are things that we need to have access to in the real estate recording process. We would need to see in the electronic process an audit trail of activity; time, date and who touched a document last and where it is now.

12. Consider requiring that any technology-based improvements to existing systems that it recommends provide for long-term maintenance and development of electronic real estate recording, including the migration, conversion and preservation of data over time. This serves as a reminder that all records are permanent. Whatever standards are proposed, you need to make allowances that all storage media and technology will be obsolete in a matter of time. Plans need to be in place for an exit strategy that allows you to go on to the next preservation tool. What will facilitate the migration from one storage medium to another and one application to another?

14. Consider developing performance standards for electronic management of real estate records that do not specify particular hardware or software applications. These should be open standards. The example used was E-sign. Here you cannot specify hardware or software except in performance standards related to recordkeeping needs.

23. Consider studying the costs and benefits of linking real estate records with other layers of public data including, for example, data regarding transportation, hydrology, topography, and political boundaries, as part of the statewide geographic information system (GIS). Goal expressed here is to integrate systems at counties so when you use GIS you can associate tax and other information under it. The key word here is linking. Make sure technology is open enough so a GIS system can access information on real estate records.

24. Consider creating a simplified platting process that would facilitate reference to real estate parcels that are subject to metes and bounds or other complex legal descriptions. This describes backroom issues and is additional detail for #23.

27. Consider making user-friendly, reliable, and convenient on- and off-site public access to real estate records an important goal of any authentication, security, and recording-priority standards that it proposes. The question here is, will the average citizen benefit from this new process? People will want access and do have a legal right to this data. Keep in mind that people will want easy access to this. What kind of data should be released to the public and security issues are being addressed by the Legal Subcommittee. On the national level there is much work on “what” will be displayed and available from this new type of system. This should be looked at closely.