

# MEETING MINUTES

## DEKALB COUNTY/CITY OF AUBURN GIS COMMITTEE

---

**Meeting Date and Time:**  
06-17-99 @ 1:00 p.m.

**Meeting Type:** Regular, Full Committee

**Meeting Location:**  
Commissioners Court

**Members Present:**

*DeKalb County:*  
Damerall, Bruce – Technical Resource Coordinator, Data Processing  
Appleman, Chad – Soil and Water Conservation Service  
Miles, Connie – County Commissioners  
Strong, Mark – County Surveyor  
Stump, Brad – Building Commissioner, Plan Commission

*City of Auburn:*  
Bruns, Steve – City Civil Engineer  
Lochner, Dave – WPC Superintendent  
Schweitzer, Chris – Planner, Dept of Building, Planning, and Development

**Others Present:**

Deputy Auditor, DeKalb County  
Pat Rothenhofer – Data Processing, DeKalb County

**Meeting Minutes By:**

Chris Schweitzer

---

**Items Discussed**

1. *Software Selection Project.* The Committee discussed and evaluated the short-lists vendors ESRI and Intergraph. Issues discussed included:
  - 1.1. *Business Philosophy.* The group agreed ESRI has a superior business philosophy - "Make a difference." ESRI employees were not paid based on commission. ESRI is GIS focused - they know GIS better than anybody. ESRI employees are there to help their users. Intergraph has their fingers in many products. The City of Auburn has been through 7 reps since 1997.
  - 1.2. *User Base.* Intergraph has 70,000 users. ESRI has over 200,000. Regionally, ESRI has dozens of Indiana State agency and numerous local government installations. Intergraph has only a few regional clients, all using legacy GIS software (MGE).
  - 1.3. *Software Functionality/Capability.* ESRI is superior in all facets of GIS functionality and software architecture. Awesome. Many of Intergraph's GIS functionality is spread among differing platforms. Ingr's new GIS products are not mature.
  - 1.4. *Communications and Support.* ESRI gets an A. Intergraph gets an F. ESRI communicates in many mediums (ArcUser, ArcNews, Virtual Campus, White Papers, etc). ESRI strives for "technology transfer" and instilling knowledge in the client. Intergraph's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing.
  - 1.5. Chris noted he had come from an Intergraph background, and at the beginning of the project was sure the City and County would select Intergraph. However, the selection process proved ESRI was superior in every way that counts.
  - 1.6. The group unanimously chose ESRI as the GIS software solutions provider.

2. *Data Conversion Timeline.* The group agreed that the cadastral component was one of the most important pieces of the project, and that cadastral conversion should occur as budgets, planning, resources, and workloads allow. A pilot project in April 2000 and finish date of June 2002 appears feasible. The Committee agreed to begin drafting the RFQ and Cadastral Agreements. Chris noted this should be fairly straight forward as previous project RFQs and Inter-Local Agreements were already in place.

The Committee discussed the impact of the landbase timeline on the assessment process. The Deputy Assessor stated that the assessment would likely begin in August 1999. The Committee noted that the Assessor would need the updated photos, and that we initially didn't select to purchase large mylar photo reproductions because the assessment was to occur at an unknown date (\$36,000 value). A possible solution would be to have ASI deliver orthos by geographic area at the request of the Assessor in order to satisfy her assessment deadline. Plots could be made onto reproducible vellum and then used as normal. Everyone wins and the County saves \$36,000. The Deputy Assessor to get more info for Committee.

3. *County GIS Coordinator.* Brad explained the County Council had heard the request and recommendation for hiring a GIS Coordinator. Brad reported positive responses from the Commissioner and Council members. Brad noted he would continue to work on job description and reference the City of Auburn's GIS/MIS Manager job description.
4. *Committee Rules and Procedures.* Brad reported his work on defining data cost-sharing results with the smaller communities of Waterloo, Butler and Garrett. He noted possible needs to put in place (faster than previously discussed by the Committee) Rules and Procedures for the County-City GIS Committee. Mark noted that this may not be necessary, as the smaller communities will definitely not move as quickly and aggressively as the County and Auburn. Mark noted that it is great to think about and be prepared for this need, but stated we need to focus our energies on the more pressing

projects. The Committee agreed to work on Rules and Procedures, but not to push them up to the top of the list.

As a tangent discussion to the Rules and Procedures, the Committee discussed the make-up of the County-City GIS Committee, and the impact of adding other communities. All agreed that the committee has worked very well thus far. Just as the City has a Technical and Policy Committee for IT, the County-City GIS Committee may benefit from a similar structure. This structure has basically been implemented, as both the City and County have elected councilmen, and commissioners represented within the committee, which form the "Policy" component.

5. **Inter-Local Agreements.** Brad noted he had "altered" the existing MOU to fit other communities. He noted that while working throughout the process, the possible need include all participating in the project to be parties in the contract (ie Include the City of Auburn in any agreements between the County and other communities, as additional participation may affect the overall project, and thus affect Auburn). However, Chris and Mark noted that the County would naturally "look out" for Auburn, and that a possible solution would be to simply amend the MOU between Auburn and the County to include a clause that reads, "County shall act in good faith on behalf of the City of Auburn when in negotiations with communities other than Auburn, and shall inform Auburn of any and all possible agreements and decisions, in draft, discussion, and final approved form prior to committing with a legal vehicle."
6. **Soils Data.** Chad explained the digital soils survey project and NRCS's possible funding support. This data was noted as obviously beneficial to many depts in the City and County. Chad stated he would further research the funding potential, and keep the committee updated.

#### **Action Items**

1. Committee to contact Intergraph and ESRI about status of selection project.
2. Chris to set up kickoff meeting with ESRI and ASI, contact members for feasibility.
3. Work on Inter-Local Agreement for Cadastral Conversion Project and RFQ.

#### **Upcoming Meetings**

- July 1, 1999 Regular Meeting @ 1:00 Commissioners Court
- July 8, 1999 Regular Meeting @ 1:00 Commissioners Court
- Unknown Date - ESRI kick-off meeting