

EGC Parcel Workgroup Meeting

2/18/14

VTrans Board Room

Present: Johnathan Croft, VTrans; Ryan Cloutier, VTrans; Leslie Pelch, VCGI; Ivan Brown, VCGI; Ginger Anderson, FPR; Dan Currier, CVRPC; Todd LeBlanc, VALA; Scott Manley, City of S. Burlington; Jim Knapp, VT Dept. of Taxes; .

Johnathan gave a quick report on where VTrans is at with their statewide parcel data project: his director asks why they should fund the whole thing when other state agencies want to use the data as well. He also asks why they need parcel data for towns that don't have state highways running through them. Johnathan said that he hasn't heard any reaction to the testimony that he and Ryan Cloutier gave at the legislature.

Dan suggested that we contact ACCD, E911 and Dept. of Public Safety to see whether they do in fact have any resources to contribute.

Ryan reported that he had not heard back yet from Chris Jolly at FHWA regarding his request to use some of the approved funds to pay for an ROI report focused on the Parcel Project and maintenance plan.

Update: Since this meeting, Ryan did hear back from Chris Jolly, who gave approval to use funds for such an ROI report. Ryan needs to talk with his director about it again, and the Contract Admin Section says that it would be *July* before such a contract could be in place. Ryan estimates that the actual work would take at least three months.

Discussion of our Parcel Data Maintenance Plan ideas:

- Should there be a mandate? Todd says no, listers will fight a mandate.
- Should money flow to towns on a per parcel basis or on a level of parcel boundary change basis?
- Should a subdivision somehow trigger the flow of boundary data to a state entity?
- Should towns be responsible for integrating the changes to boundaries, or should a state entity be responsible?
- Jim described how credit unions keep track of real estate information: low paid technicians travel from town to town on a regular route, searching land records for changes, liens, etc. Perhaps we could have a similar situation to constantly scan for subdivisions and have those technicians actually scan and upload subdivision plats and deeds as needed. Or at least flag needed changes in that town.
- We need an online database of land records!
- There could be multiple flows of information into a state entity which would use that information to go after boundary change info.

- That entity would compile whatever data is available, then actively search out updated data or perform edits based on whatever information is available.

Three scenarios:

I

Money flows to towns to help them fund updates to their parcel data. Amount would be based on an index that indicates volume of change to boundaries in that town. Towns that choose not to participate give that power to the RPCs who coordinate collection and updating of parcel data for that town. State entity would still have to coordinate: determining amount to be sent to each town, sending money, collecting data from towns and RPCs (or mapping contractors). Perhaps town doesn't actually get the money until the updated data is provided.

II

State entity has person who reviews flows of information to identify parcel boundary changes. Some updated data would flow directly to that person, other edits would be made by that person based on info available. Many towns/cities would still want to manage their own data, so not sure how much difference there really is between these scenarios.

III

Hire contractor to do II above.

Amount given to each town would have a minimum (\$800?) but above that would be based on some index of land record change. Could combine:

- Property transfer tax
- Wastewater permits
- Act 250 Permits
- Curb cut permits on state highways
- E911 changes
- Grand List changes

Sources of funding:

General Fund

Property Transfer Tax – could trigger fee for each time someone has to pay the tax - \$20 each one for about 25,000 transactions would add up to \$500,000!

Jim looked into whether they could make this sort of a change and learned that the Tax Dept. will not have an opportunity to add fees to the “fee bill” for another 2-3 years. He and his colleagues had some other ideas about how to generate some revenue, however: fees “...tagged onto various programs administered by the agencies that would use them. For example, we could add \$50.00 to a Wastewater Permit application filed with ANR to account for the cost of mapping the resulting lots. Add a fee to Act 250 applications (double dip on projects that had both a WW permit and an Act 250 Permit). Add \$XX onto the application fee for a current use (farm, farm building, forestland) application. VTRANS – add a fee to the highway access permit application. That way we become less attached to a particular revenue source.”

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, March 18, 2014

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Vermont Life Building, 5th Floor, Board Room