



-- General Legislative Info --

-- Depts & Commissions --

Homepage

Members

Upcoming Meetings

Meeting Minutes

Resources on the Web

Subcommittees

Task Force Forms

Pilot Activity

ERERTF Standards

2001 Legislative Report

2002 Legislative Report

2003 Legislative Report

2004 Legislative Report

Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

GIS Subcommittee

SCOPE: This group will provide insight to the consultants on issues and concerns that include but are not limited to:

- GIS needs and requirements.
- PIN needs and issues.
- Technology issues of linking real estate documents to date regarding hydrology, topography, etc.

MEMBERS:

Dave Arbeit	Land Management Information Center
David Claypool, Chair	County Surveyor - Ramsey County Deputy Auditor - Stearns
Denny Kron	County Recorder - Renville
Gail Miller	County Recorder - Lyon
Jeanine Barker	Attorney at Law
Paul Kiltinen	

MEETING MATERIALS:

[Minutes from January 14, 2002](#)

SUBCOMMITTEE RESOURCES:

Send comments regarding this site to:
www@commissions.leg.state.mn.us

Updated: 01/22/02(jhr)



-- General Legislative Info --

-- Depts & Commissions --

Homepage

Members

Upcoming Meetings

Meeting Minutes

Resources on the Web

Subcommittees

Task Force Forms

Pilot Activity

ERERTF Standards

2001 Legislative Report

2002 Legislative Report

2003 Legislative Report

2004 Legislative Report

Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

GIS Subcommittee

Minutes: 14 January 2002
Meeting began 10:00am

Attendees: David Claypool, David Arbeit, Gail Miller

The following is a review of the concerns that the GIS subcommittee has articulated that should be considered by the consultant group as they begin working on ERE standards. The following are numbered as referenced by the 37 considerations in the ERE Workplan.

Consideration # 1: There is a need to clearly identify the county systems that are already capable of supporting GIS tools. There are no formal documented hardware/software standards to support this kind of tool. ESRI vendor has GIS software InterGraph vendor has GIS software. These are the two main vendors with GIS applications. Most counties doing anything at all are using one of these two tools. Both of these are capable of linking to the major relational databases out there. Any software and hardware used for GIS should be easily compliant with ERE standards.

Concerns # 3 and #4 are of interest to GIS and the following questions should be considered:

- Is there a GIS system in the county?
- Who is responsible for maintaining this (county department)?
- Is it parcel based? --- Do you use a parcel identifier as a key?
- Do you re-use parcel ID numbers? ---- How do you handle expired numbers?
- How frequently is GIS data updated?
- How are zoning maps stored, if digital – was software and what department owns this?
- What is the GIS investment your county has made to-date.

Consideration #4: Inventory should include such information as: what software do you

use to maintain this data (could be MCCC, zoning maps (GIS system, auto-cad....))

Ask what department owns any of these data sources or is responsible for it?

Consideration #4: Categories would also include wetland, feedlots, hazard waste locations, well locations (held by dept of health right now in a GIS system).

Consideration #11: An important feature would be the ability to link to GIS and be compatible with an ERER system. It is desirable to have the ability to link recorded information to a graphical search. Dakota County is an example. It is also desirable to have the ability to query parcels through GIS system. Example: If you see a parcel on map, you should also be able to see data / information related to that parcel. Maybe even see an image of documents recorded for that parcel once searched and found.

This could also include identifying some options for completing a process to include historical GIS information. The recommendations could be just a go-forward plan with GIS but it could also include a plan that from time to time recommended you add historical data to this database.

Consideration #12 - Consideration #13 - Consideration #15 - Consideration #16: The GIS guidelines that are out there need to be reviewed in order to make sure this is a standard that incorporates well. The standards must allow smooth migration and integration.

Consideration #13: Review the article (Identifying Land Parcels – Is a Statewide Standard Needed?) MN Geographic Metadata Guideline – this can be downloaded. Another question is, how up-to-date is the data you are using?

Consideration #16 (v): Regarding parcel number – one way to verify this number would be visually, through GIS map

Consideration #20: Consider making street addresses a part of index standards. The US Postal standard should be considered as a standard. Addresses are usually part of the tax database but not with the real estate database. With GIS, searches can be made or addresses determined and cross referenced. Addresses need to be standardized so any database utilizing them can be referenced to searches involving real estate and tax databases.

Consideration #23 & Consideration #25: Some pilots need to deal with linking to a GIS system. That county would need a reasonably developed GIS system and use Parcel ID indexing. The recording side needs to be using Parcel ID to complete the link. Study cost / benefit if there is not a county ready to pilot this. Get a focus group together to catalog the benefits (may be quickest way). One of the major costs involved here may be in populating data with parcel ID's to get the linkage to happen in a county.

Consideration #24: This concern covers two areas, one, simplifying the platting process and two, simplifying descriptions. Platting simplifies the descriptions and is in fact a reason to plat. The platting process is sometimes time consuming and other avenues to speed up the process (or simplify it) are being considered. One avenue being considered is the proposed Certified Survey Map (CSM). It is controversial that the CSM would in fact simplify the platting process. The present plat reviews taking place in many counties enter the new parcels, thoroughfares and sometimes easements created by new plats, directly into their respective GIS data bases.

Consideration #27: Review off-site access points like Dakota County.

Consideration #35: It would be a good question to ask a county what their GIS investments are to-date.

Meeting ended 12:00 noon.

Send comments regarding this site to:
www@commissions.leg.state.mn.us

Updated: 01/22/02(jhr)