

Planning subcommittee report

9 January 2004

Present: Joel Beckman, Julie Bergh, Bert Black, Luci Botzek, Jeff Carlson, Mike Cunniff, John Engerholm, Bob Horton, Greg Hubinger, Cindy Koosman, John Lally, Scott Loomer, Beth McNerny, Gail Miller, Bill Mori, Chuck Parsons, Leonard Peterson.

Subcommittee charge

“Bob Horton amended his motion to approve the language [in the bill] as written as a placeholder, but the task force will at the same time establish a subcommittee to begin to explore the issues discussed about the long term maintenance of standards and the support of electronic real estate recording. Chuck Hoyum seconded the motion. Bob Horton would serve as co-chair, with a co-chair to be named by MACO when its user group is established.” (11 December 2003 ERERTF minutes)

Recommendations

The group went over the work plan submitted to the legislature in 2001, determining which tasks were done, are in progress and/or have not been done (see attached).

At the conclusion of that review, the consensus was that the significant tasks remaining on the plan were contingent on the completion of the pilot projects and specifically on Phase II. As well, the consensus was that the definition of the Task Force, in terms of the long term maintenance of standards and the support of electronic real estate recording, was contingent on our definition of Phase II. A preliminary cost analysis of Phase II was done last year, based on the premise of having five counties participate. But the feasibility of Phase II, as currently defined, was questioned on the basis of its complexity, scope and costs.

The subcommittee recommends to the Task Force that it needs to analyze and re-define Phase II, especially to detail the proposed budget, before it can revise its request for extension to the legislature. This analysis should consider:

1. the length of time Phase II will take
2. the costs, up front and over the life cycle of the systems, to implement Phase II
3. the costs per county (among the five pilots participating in the pilots) and to the county
4. the impact of scaling back the number of participants in Phase II to two counties
5. the impact of encouraging more counties to participate in Phase I filing
6. the prospective revenues for the Task Force based on the current filing surcharges

Analyzing these issues will provide the framework for determining the future governance and membership of the Task Force, as well as shape the bill submitted to the legislature for the extension of the Task Force. Because the legislative deadlines for submitting and revising the bill are looming, the Task Force has to move quickly. The priority should be revisiting the cost-feasibility analysis.