

MEETING MINUTES

COUNTY-CITY GIS COMMITTEE

Meeting Date and Time:
2-01-01 @ 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
Rowe, Sally – Zoning Administrator
Strong, Mark – Surveyor

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

Others Present:

Park, Kent - ASI

Meeting Minutes By:

Brad Stump

Items Discussed

1. *Landbase Delivery Area Status*
 - 1.1. No status change to Areas 1 or 3 since the 1/4/01 Committee meeting. Area 1 fixes had been reviewed and outstanding errors were sent to ASI for further action. The initial data delivery for Area 3 had been reviewed and errors not corrected locally were sent to ASI for further action.
 - 1.2. Area 2 fixes review has been substantially completed and any outstanding errors will be shipped to ASI for resolution within a week.
 - 1.3. As was mentioned at the previous meeting, the orthophotography for Area 4 has been delivered. The planimetric data was on a corrupt CD but ASI has shipped us another one and data review will get underway soon.
 - 1.4. Orthophotos for Area 5 have been delivered and ASI anticipates that planimetric data will be shipped within the next 2 – 4 weeks.
2. *Landbase Project Lifecycle*
 - 2.1. Chris presented a document providing a simplified visual representation of the Landbase project's data edit/review lifecycle.
3. *Cadastral Conversion Project Status*
 - 3.1. Chris and Brad will be discussing the latest draft of the Cadastral Scope with Kent Park immediately after the GIS Committee meeting. The document will then be forwarded on to ASI Colorado immediately after the meeting with any further questions/changes.
 - 3.2. Brad reported that the location of the GPS control points established for the County by George Machlan are ready to be geocoded and imported into the database however he and Chris had not yet had time to actually perform the geocoding. They will try to have this completed by the next meeting or, at worst, by the first meeting in March. Other issues are more time critical at this point and therefore require more immediate attention.
 - 3.3. Butler's attorney has not responded to the opportunity to review the draft Inter-local agreement for the Cadastral project. The Committee members decided to go ahead and get approvals from the County and City of Auburn.
4. *GIS Data Use*
 - 4.1. The group discussed the data use/sharing policy. The Committee members decided to have Brad and Chris draft a data sharing policy document for discussion and determine how to implement this policy (i.e. by resolution, by ordinance, etc.). They were also asked to investigate how our policies may be affected by issues raised at the upcoming February 16th seminar regarding the legal issues relating to public access to digital and spatial data (reported to Committee last meeting).
 - 4.2. Kent Park provided draft copies of two proposed bills pending action in this session of the Indiana House of Representatives. House Bills 1402 and 1508 deal with changes in the existing laws as they relate to fees that may be charged for electronic maps. HB 1402 would eliminate the ability of an agency to recover some of the costs involved in creating and maintaining an electronic map. The bill, as proposed, would only allow for the cost of the media upon which the data is transferred. The Committee felt strongly that this was a bad change. He proposed change in the law appears to allow a commercial entity to obtain the data for free and then use that data in making a profit without any financial expenditure on its part and without any financial benefit accruing to the taxpayers who initially funded the data creation. This basically creates a situation where taxpayers are providing a free subsidy to a private business interest but get no return on their investment. HB 1502 removes the provision that certain groups as defined in the law may get copies of an agency's the electronic map without charge when the data is to be used for not-for-profit purposes. This would allow an agency to charge all users for

the data. This proposed amendment does not change the current provisions that allow a public agency to recapture a reasonable percentage of the cost of maintaining, upgrading and enhancing the electronic map. IC 5-14-3-2 defines "electronic map" as "**copyrighted data provided by a public agency from an electronic geographic information system**".

5. *MRBC Partnership Opportunities*

- 5.1. Chris noted that Steve, Brad and himself had met with representatives of the Maumee River Basin Commission on January 30th. Present for the meeting were MRBC Director Rod Renkenberger, MRBC member and Allen County SWCD representative Greg Lake, MRBC Buffer Initiative Specialist Jon Bickel, and USDA representative Dave Hines. Also present in her capacity as GIS Committee member and DeKalb County SWCD representative was Sarah Reymann. The meeting focused on two issues.
- 5.2. Rod Renkenberger explained the MRBC's participation in the 319 Filter Strip program whereby landowners are paid to convert land use along waterways to a land use that reduces runoff and sedimentation into the waterway. To monitor the program, the MRBC is mapping land use throughout the study area so as to be able to report progress on land use conversion to IDEM (administrating agency in Indiana). The MRBC wanted to discuss how the data as being collected and explore the possibility of utilizing the data in a GIS environment in the future. This was discussed by the group along with ways by which land tracts and land uses are now identified in the study area (USDA farm number). The intent is to use DOQQ data to place points representing the tracts and then perform a comparison of the point location against a parcel data layer to determine owner. This appears to be possible however the accuracy will only be usable as a general planning tool for MRBC purposes. It will not meet the accuracy standards of the current County-City GIS project.
- 5.3. Rod Renkenberger remained to discuss the second issue with Chris, Steve and Brad. Because of e MRBS flood study for some of the waterways in DeKalb County, the FIRM maps are to be updated as the GIS Committee has discussed on several past occasions. While the Digital FIRMs will contain the "official" location of the floodplain limits, the location of the extent of the floodplain will be determined by comparing the flood heights established by the study with the contour data on the USGS quad maps (10' contour interval, approximate contour locations). Because the City of Auburn acquired more accurate contour data, the M RBC would like to use the contour data to establish much more accurate location of the floodplain limits in the Auburn area. Auburn may be willing to do this because it benefits their constituents. Rod commented that if contour data could be acquired for other areas in DeKalb County then the DFIRMs for those areas would also benefit from improved accuracy. Because of the local investment in map data and accuracy, Rod would like to explore the possibility of the MRBC partnering with the County to acquire contour data for other areas of the County. Also, to show the MRBC members what types of data the County and City have acquired, Rod would like to see if the March meeting could be held in Auburn's City Hall and the GIS data be presented for discussion. Rod, Chris and Brad will explore this further and check on the meeting relocation as well as the potential for additional contour mapping.

6. *FEMA DFIRM*

- 6.1. The Committee agreed that we should seriously consider an opportunity to partner with the MRBC to acquire additional contour data and obtain better flood maps. Brad is to talk to the Commissioners about the possibility and let them know that we are exploring it further.
- 6.2. Based on the discussions with the MRBC, Brad recommended that we explore further the option of getting contours and using them to obtain better positional accuracy of the floodplain limits on the DFIRM. Once we know if this is an option then we can decide if we what to partner with FEMA on another level beyond that of just providing our existing data. The Committee agreed that we should investigate this possibility. Mark Strong indicated that he still believed costs were going to be higher that we would like. Brad agreed that before we take a request for contour funding to the Council, we must first believe the costs are justified by the benefits and be comfortable taking that position. Kent Park suggested that he get us some quotes on acquisition of contour data using LIDAR (aerial **L**ight **D**etection **A**nd **R**anging) technology. ASI did not have LIDAR technology available when the project was initially flown in 1999 however they have acquired LIDAR capability since that time period. This technology significantly reduces the cost to capture topographic data and increases the accuracy of the resulting DTM should one be created from it. LIDAR can be used solely to create a topographic map similar to what we are exploring and it can meet ASPRS class I accuracies. The Committee asked Kent to provide quotes on the project. If additional data is captured then it may be for the whole County or it may only be for limited areas along waterways.

Action Items

- ?? Chris and Brad to provide an outline of the data sharing policy for discussion at the next meeting
- ?? Committee to continue debating Policies for distribution of data in preparation for BOW/CoC approval.
- ?? City to begin working on Utility Conversion RFQ
- ?? Chris, Brad and Chad Depew to complete a secondary QA/QC review on selected data from the second deliverable.
- ?? Brad to continue work on the Floodplain mapping issue and the possibilities for additional contour acquisition

Upcoming Meetings

- ?? February 15, 2001 @ 1:00 - Second Floor Conference Room City Hall
- ?? March 1, 2001 @ 1:00 - Second Flood Conference Room City Hall