

# MEETING MINUTES

## COUNTY-CITY GIS COMMITTEE

---

**Meeting Date and Time:**  
07-20-00 @ 1:00 p.m.

**Meeting Type:** Regular, Full Committee

**Meeting Location:**  
Second Floor Conference Room, City Hall

**Members Present:**

*DeKalb County:*  
Stump, Brad – GIS Coordinator  
Strong, Mark – Surveyor  
Damerell, Bruce – Technical Resource Coordinator  
Rowe, Sally – Building Commissioner

*City of Auburn:*  
Schweitzer, Chris – GIS/MIS Manager  
Bruns, Steve – City Engineer

*City of Butler:*  
Schweitzer, Amy - Planner

**Others Present:**

**Meeting Minutes By:**  
Brad Stump

---

### Items Discussed

1. *Landbase Area 1 Delivery Status*
  - 1.1. Chris informed the Committee that we have not had a chance to review very much of the area 1 delivery due to time spent troubleshooting GIS program performance issues which have now been addressed (slow redraw with the software). We have been able to review three or four tiles with a large number of features and the data quality appears to be good. We will continue to review the data very thoroughly however it looks promising.
2. *Maps on the Intranet.*
  - 2.1. Chris showed the Committee a sample map provided over the intranet via ArcIMS. As has been stated in the past, it is the intention to eventually allow all city and county users to review GIS data via an Internet browser and only deploy specialized GIS software to those who will need it to perform their jobs. Those on the network can access the site by typing <http://cord>.
3. *Beta test site for ArcSDE*
  - 3.1. Chris explained ESRI's Beta test program. The benefits to our participation in this program appear to be worth the time spent reporting on problems encountered since we are already reporting any problems encountered on current releases. In this way we hope to send in some feedback that will allow problems to be fixed or features to be added before the program is released for mainstream use. If the time does not appear to be a good investment then we can withdraw from the program at any time in the future.
4. *Cadastral Conversion Vendor Selection*
  - 4.1. The Committee debated the strengths and weaknesses of the two cadastral conversion vendors for approximately ninety minutes. The relative equality of the firms makes this selection much more difficult than the selection of a vendor for the landbase project.
  - 4.2. Generally, the Committee felt that the Schneider Corporation's greatest strength appeared to be its communication with its clients and its commitment to the service it provides for those clients. The reference checks all supported the Schneider Corporation's commitment to client communication. A secondary strength was the Schneider Corporation's business partnership with ProVal. It was felt that this might make it easier for them to make any necessary connections between the GIS database and the ProVal database. If the ProVal database is ODBC compliant as is believed then the Committee felt that this might not be as important as would otherwise be the case. One of the Schneider Corporation's areas of potential liability appeared to be the relatively low number of similar type projects that they had completed to date. The information that they supplied indicated few cadastral projects where they had created the digital parcel fabric themselves via digitizing and cogo methods, instead many of their references were for instances where they were able to take existing digital maps and georeference them to a GIS control network. Another area of potential liability for the Schneider Corporation was the limited size and limited experience of their GIS Department. While they appeared to have several key people with good qualifications, the pool of available experts from which they could draw was limited which could be a disadvantage if they were to lose any of those key individuals.
  - 4.3. It was felt that one of ASI's greatest strengths is the expertise and depth of its GIS staff. The ASI staff members that the Committee has dealt with thus far have demonstrated a great deal of professional knowledge. ASI's focus on GIS services as their primary business has allowed them to build a deep staff of GIS professionals. Another of ASI's strengths was the number and type of projects that they had completed. Based on ASI's Statement of Qualifications and the reference checks conducted by the Committee, ASI appears to have successfully

completed many projects similar in scope to our proposed project. One of ASI's weaknesses noted to date was the unsatisfactory level of communications and lack responsiveness of the former project manager. The communications and responsiveness have improved considerably with the assignment of a new project manager so it is hoped that this problem was specific to the individual and not a function of the internal workload placed on ASI project management staff. Another of the potential liabilities noted by the Committee was ASI's internal financial situation. ASI has listed information on its website relating to its internal reorganization of staff, its appointment of a new CEO, its loss of stock value over the last 24 months and its efforts to raise operating capital, possibly through a merger or buyout. The Committee's concern was to avoid entering a contract with a firm and then being partially through the contract period when the firm suffered a financial reverse such as bankruptcy. If financial considerations allow the County and City to shorten the time frame of the project, the window of vulnerability is decreased. The Committee felt that ASI did not appear to be in as vulnerable position as others would lead us to believe and were, in fact, taking positive steps to increase the strength of the firm.

- 4.4. The Committee consensus was that both firms would probably perform adequately for the Committee however two-thirds of the Committee members present felt that ASI was probably the better of the two firms based on ASI's expertise and experience. The consensus of the Committee was to hold off on making a final decision and allow another week to check the data delivered by ASI. If the data meets expectations then ASI will be selected as the lead firm for negotiations on the Cadastral conversion, if there are more problems than expected then the Schneider Corporation will be selected as the lead firm. Should negotiations with the lead firm not proceed as desired, the County-City GIS Committee will reserve the right to negotiate with the second firm.

#### **Action Items**

- Committee to work on Cadastral Inter-local agreements.
- City to begin working on Utility Conversion RFQ
- Chris, Brad and Chad Depew (Engineering Dept) to continue QA/QC work on the first deliverable.

#### **Upcoming Meetings**

- August 3, 2000 @ 1:00 - Second Floor Conference Room City Hall
- August 17, 2000 @ 1:00 - Second Floor Conference Room City Hall