

MEETING MINUTES

DEKALB COUNTY/CITY OF AUBURN GIS COMMITTEE

Meeting Date and Time:
08-12-99 @ 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:
Schweitzer, Chris – GIS/MIS Manager
Bruns, Steve - City Engineer
Lochner, Dave - WPC Superintendent

Others Present:

Deputy Assessor, DeKalb County
Schweitzer, Amy, City of Butler, City Planner

Meeting Minutes By:

Chris Schweitzer

Items Discussed

1. *Update of Landbase Contract.*

- *Database Design.* Chris noted that he and Brad Stump had reviewed the first draft of the Landbase Database Design submitted by ASI. Chris stated that the database was the technical application of what the City Engineer, County Surveyor, and others had helped define earlier in the year at the Kickoff meeting. Chris and Brad noted that a few discrepancies had been identified and that a review summary was to be submitted to ASI and ESRI in a few days. It appeared that a pilot project would not be delivered until next month at the earliest. Chris noted that neither the City or County were not discouraged by the minor change in schedule, as each were dealing with getting hardware and software in place.
- *AT Report.* Chris noted that ASI had completed the AT solution and had performed the final Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) analysis which uses known coordinates provided by the City of Auburn and DeKalb County and compares them against derived coordinates generated from ASI AT solution. Chris noted that ASI had used the post-flight Photo ID points provided by the City and County as well as selected pre-targeted points (1997 D.A. Brown GPS work). Remaining pre-flight targets will be collected and analyzed during compilation. All results and findings of the AT solution will be described in an AT report submitted by ASI during the week of August 16.

2. *Cadastral Inter-Local Agreement and RFQ.* Chris noted that he was working on the drafts of said documents. The Committee concurred that their January 2000 goal of sending out a Cadastral RFQ was way off, but the Committee should get their Cadastral ducks in a row so we can move forward when required.

3. *GIS Day.* Chris proposed both the City and County participate in the first ever GIS Day. ESRI (the GIS software provider), the National Geographic Society, and the Association of American Geographers were supporting and promoting the first-ever GIS day on November 19, 1999 at the end of Geography Awareness Week. Chris noted his interest in seeing the City and County participate in this educational event. GIS Day sponsors will be providing materials, and had a goal of educating 1 million people of GIS technology. Chris thought that the City and County might be able to hold a small event this year for local students, the public, and our peers. Chris noted that the City and County could participate at a greater level in 2000 as employees across the organization will have been exposed to and better understand GIS. The group concurred that the City and County should participate in some fashion in GIS Day 1999. Chris encouraged anyone interested in participating in GIS Day do so. Chad Appleman noted that the NRCS would likely love to participate in such an event.

4. *County-City Connectivity.* Chris noted that a VERY important issue of the County-City partnership was that of connectivity. The sharing of information will not be as effective if a direct real time link cannot be made. At this point, dark fiber (fiber that has been installed but not hooked up) is in place. Only minor technical planning and legal issues are to be worked through.

Mark Strong inquired about connectivity to other participating City's. Brad Stump and Bruce Damerall noted that many options existed for remote locations in the City, including fiber optics, T-1 lines, ISDN, cutting CD periodically, and Internet. Steve Bruns stated that Garrett and Waterloo were good candidates for Fiber Optic connectivity due to the Electric Department's fiber proximity to said cities. Chris noted that remote locations would (until a faster connection is obtained) likely obtain CDs of digital orthophotography due to their static nature. City's might also initially obtain a CD of basemap data collected by the County and begin building their own data sets upon the basemap. Updates of the basemap data would likely be obtained by connecting to the City-County Map Server via the Internet and download only needed data. True feature streaming (sending actual data packets, and not images, over the Internet) would mitigate the need for expensive high speed connections and laborious CD-cutting procedures.

5. **Soils Data Conversion.** Chad Appleman reported that he had further investigated the use of SSURGO soils data. He noted that SSURGO had used 1:12000 scale DOQ and digitized existing Order 2 soils surveys on the DOQ. This is by law the soil survey to be used by state and local officials. He noted that SSURGO could adjust the soils data to fit our basemap accuracy. It appeared the street cost would be around \$52,000 for the entire county, but grants were likely available. He noted that representatives from SSURGO were interested in speaking with the County and City about its soil data needs. The group confirmed a meeting time of September 29 @ 1:00 PM in the County Annex building.
6. **County Implementation Issues.** Brad Stump noted that the County still needed pricing and an approximate timeline to present to the County Council. Brad commented that the County may desire to hire the services of a professional firm to put together a cost and timeline plan for the Council and Committee. Mark Strong stated he believed the County Council is only in need of an approximate cost for the fundamental data and components, not the minute details of every application. He stated that he believed it could be done in-house, although it would put a little more strain on existing staff. He also noted that the Council should understand development and investment of the GIS- and its benefits - will be ongoing. The group concurred. Chris indicated that the County may simply want to go through an exercise similar to that the City performed when obtaining data conversion costs for the ITMP plan.

Action Items

- County to prepare timeline and costs for Council
- Committee to place Cadastral Agreement and RFQ at top of priority list
- Committee to continue working on Implementation Plan
- County and City to forward Database Design Draft Review Comments to ASI and ESRI

Upcoming Meetings

- August 19, 1999 @ Commissioners Court
- September 29, 1999 @ 1:00 County Annex Red Room - SSURGO Presentation (Soils)