



-- 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

Recording Content and Workflow Subcommittee

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

- County office groups (Recorder, Auditor and Treasurer) necessary to validate recording process needs.
- Private industry needs and workflow concerns.
- County processes and general knowledge of current workflow.
- Electronic fees and documents collected for other state offices.

MEMBERS

Angela Burrs	County Auditor - Fillmore
Denny Kron, Co-Chair	County Deputy Auditor - Stearns
Don Goedken	Department of Transportation
Gail Miller	County Recorder - Renville
Jeff Carlson, Co-Chair	CI Title
John Lally	Department of Revenue
Larry Dalien	County Property Records - Anoka
Paul McGinley	Loucks & McIagan
Steven Baker	City Assessor - Minneapolis
Steven Ruhlik	County Treasurer - Steele

MEETING MATERIALS:

[Minutes from January 10, 2002](#)

[Minutes from April 25th and 29, 2002](#)

SUBCOMMITTEE RESOURCES:

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

Updated: 05/06/03(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

Recording Content and Workflow Subcommittee

Minutes: 10 January 2002

In Attendance: Angela Burrs- Fillmore County Auditor, Denny Kron, Deputy Auditor Stearns, Don Goedken DOT, Gail Miller Recorder Renville, Jeff Carlson CI Title, Larry Dalien Anoka County Recorder, Paul McGinley Surveyor Loucks & McLagan, Jeanine Barker, Lyon County Recorder

This subcommittee walked through their particular workflow needs and identified areas for consideration by the consultants. Considerations that were specifically identified are listed at the end of this document.

Don Goedken - DOT

Data Content areas for concentrated analysis:

1. Tract Index – we need this to research how title is held (who owns property)
2. PIN – this needs to be tied into the record and needs to be unique, there are too many issues around its unique value
3. Multiple Grantors – we would like to continue to see all grantors listed.

Workflow

1. We walk documents through to the Recorder's office: Deeds, Right of Way Plat (statute 160.05) Lis Pendens, Mortgage Releases
2. Final Certificates need a wet signature,
3. Any Certified copy of orders has DOT stamp on them and then they are filed at the Recorder's office. We receive document numbers while we wait – the DOT Stamp could be an issue.

Denny Kron – Deputy Auditor Stearns

1. The Parcel ID Number (PIN#) should be standard. For GIS, the County prefix number given to the county by the state (Stearns is #73) would be useful for this issue. Also many counties reuse the PIN#. This is somewhat of a problem but a PIN# is only a tool to get information and not the recording number, such as a document number. This should be one of the questions asked at counties. Do you use PIN#s and what information do you use for the PIN# and do you reuse them?

Land Surveyors Concerns: Paul McGinley, L.S.

- One primary activity currently is for research at the County Recorders office, although numerous documents created by Land Surveyors (LS) are recorded and would need to be accommodated in the electronic recording process.
- Filing of subdivision plats (Chapter 505 of Minnesota statutes). Files can be large, graphic files with numerous landowners and government agencies signing, often not at the same time or same location. (Many other legal real estate documents will have the same multiple signature status that will have to be accommodated). Having subdivision plats on-line should be included in the pilots since they are significant real estate documents and will need to be merged into county GIS systems in the future, if they already aren't in a particular county.
- CIC (common interest community) plats = cooperatives, condos and townhouses. Similarly complex with multiple signatures.
- RLS (registered land survey) – goes to Registrar of Titles office. Also a graphic file in the form of a legal document that would have to be recorded in real estate records.
- Certain Survey maps get filed with both the Registrar of Titles office and the District Court as well as the Recorder's office.
- Street and Road Vacation Resolutions – may originate at a City or via the district court (also would include street and road opening documents)
- Surveyors will sometimes have to file a Certificate of Correction for land subdivision plats – these get filed in county recorders office or registrar of titles office.
- Property Registration Statutes need the legal subcommittee to look at them. There are provisions in them requiring that recorded documents (such as the RLS above) be of a particular size sheet made of a certain mylar material, etc. Some of these requirements, and possibly others, would have to be statutorily revised to allow electronic recording.
- Certain filings are done by the title company usually, but the nature of the document being recorded, such as the subdivision plat or RLS or condo floor plan, would have to be created by the surveyor in a format compatible with electronic filing.
- When recording any land split (RLS, plat or CIC such as a condo) the Torrens examiner of titles may need to be involved if the property is torrens (registered land). Also, any filing of a land split such as these alerts the treasurer's office that real estate taxes must be paid; and auditor's office checks for delinquent taxes. Sometimes this starts with Treasurers office before the Recorder sees it (Fillmore County for example)

Larry Dalien – Anoka County Recorder

- Consideration should be given to the politics in the offices. Some people may feel threatened by the presence of the consultants. They should be aware of this before going in.
- Race to notice is an issue to be considered with electronic filing. Things should be sequential. How will this be handled with e-recording? Similar to how batch postal mail is handled?

Angela Burrs – Fillmore County Auditor

- Taxes are collected before recorders file a deed.
- CRV: documents are multipart paper. The auditor numbers it and stamps it and sends it to the Dept of Revenue. SS# is on the document and there are privacy issues. Someone

should look into this area.

- Collection of delinquent taxes is done prior to recording of deed. Deeds need to start in the Auditor – Treasurer’s office.
- Auditor and Treasurer need to be able to collect taxes owed. How this will be accomplished, either by using one collection point or several, needs to be determined.
- If they emboss a deed or mortgage – how will this be handled in e-recording world?
- Green Acres tax: you need to be able to search out taxes prior to granting Green Acres rights to a property. When it gets sold you need to be able to remove tax shields and recalculate tax fees.
- You need the ability to reject or return documents sent in as "not recorded". If documents are not compliant with standards you must be able to reject what is not right.
- You must be able to accept but still hold onto documents until funds are in an account. Documents should not be recorded until funds clear the account. How can this be handled in e-recording world?
- Auditors have to maintain real estate tax systems and part of this is managing an accurate parcel database. Parcel numbers are important here. They check to ensure that taxpayer has the correct size, shape and parcel of record. This would be covered under Statue # 272-01, 272-115, 272-121, 272-19, 272-119, these are some of the areas that explain the Auditor’s Review.

Jeff Carlson – CI Title

- Marriage License and Birth Certificate, are just two examples of certified and stamped or embossed documents. How will this be managed in e-recording?

Gail Miller – Recorder Renville

- Archiving is an issue. What is the process for backups and archives? The Historical Society has standards for archiving and should be included in this area of standards.

Consideration #22: Courts have documents that are certified copies that must be recorded. How will this be handled in e-recording?

Consideration #23: We need to see where everyone is at with a GIS system at their office. This will help define where people need to go. Doing C/B may be out of scope.

What benefit would a Recorder’s office get out of layering these documents with GIS information? This should be detailed out by the consultants.

Does everyone have ½ section maps? Pictorial of division within a plot. Parcel ID# needs to relate to GIS map. Does everyone have Parcel ID? Is it a unique number in a county or are they reusing them? If they reuse it this could make historical searches inaccurate. An ID may pull up information it was related to previously and not to the parcel it is associated with now.

Consideration #24: We need to get to a point where you can code a parcel to make it easier to locate. A code is needed to locate a piece and verify legal description. This is like a parent / child relationship. This would be a description of that parcel (CSM). That code would then live with that parcel. It is cheaper to do it this way. But is this truly in scope?

Consideration #25: Should the PIN number be standard?

Consideration #26: A Public / Private collaboration would work best here. There should be a stake

holder's committee. ERER will continue after this initiative is complete, or some such group. Something like the legislature creation of LRM group.

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

Updated: 01/22/02(jhr)

Content and Workflow Subcommittee

25 and 29 April 2002

Present: Larry Dalien, Scott Loomer, Jeff Carlson, Keith Scheider (BenNevis), Paul Backus (BenNevis), Pam Trombo (BenNevis) Luci Botzek,, Gail Miller (phone), Angela Burrs (Phone), Denny Kron (phone)

These meetings were a review of the schema for satisfactions and closing use cases.

It was discussed that for the sake of good content and workflow there should be no reuse of parcel numbers in a county system. A state-wide unique PIN should be associated for each land parcel.

Leonard Peterson from the Department of Revenue suggested that the PIN be kept with the parent property on a split.

The sequential numbering of filings was discussed. Larry Dalien suggested that numbering should be at the time of receipt. It was also discussed that the priority number is established at the Recorder's office, regardless if the document initiates in the Auditor or Treasurer's offices.

The suggestion from this group was to make date / time the initial priority indicator and then use the order # as the secondary indicator. Order # would be used if filings came in bulk and were assigned the same date / time, then the order sequence in that bulk load would be the second indicator.

Documents coming in after hours would be processed the next business day. They would be processed in the order that they were sent.

It was agreed that the document number should not indicate sequence, as stated in legislation.

Schema Feedback:

- Put an "exempt" option in the fees schema
- Add receipt # to schema
- Allow multiple scanned documents in image