

# MEETING MINUTES

## COUNTY-CITY GIS COMMITTEE

---

**Meeting Date and Time:**  
4-04-01 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM

**Meeting Type:** Special, Cadastral Kickoff Meeting Participants

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

**Members Present:**  
*DeKalb County:*  
Strong, Mark – Surveyor  
Stump, Brad – GIS Coordinator  
Damerell, Bruce – Technical Resource Coordinator

*City of Auburn:*  
Schweitzer, Chris – GIS/MIS Manager  
Bruns, Steve – City Engineer  
Lochner, Dave – Water Pollution Control Superintendent

**Others Present:**  
Sommers, LaMar – ASI  
Park, Kent – ASI  
Nichols, Mike – ASI

**Meeting Minutes By:**  
Chris Schweitzer

---

### Items Discussed

- 1) Overview and Intro
  - a) The County-City GIS Committee met with ASI to hold the Cadastral Kickoff meeting. The Committee welcomed ASI, and introductions were made. Those present discussed many important issues as follows:
- 2) Establishment of PLSS
  - a) The group discussed two possible approaches to obtaining the PLSS grid that will serve as the framework for constructing the cadastral fabric.
    - i) Option 1: CoCiGIS to take first pass at providing PLSS data to ASI. ASI would fill in missing data and push back to Committee. The Committee would then review ASI work, and provide final, to-be-used PLSS data to ASI with Cadastral Packet deliverable.
    - ii) Option 2: CoCiGIS provides FINAL PLSS points to ASI with source packets. The group agreed this option would be preferred, as ASI would not provide any noticeable added accuracy to CoCiGIS provided PLSS data. ASI would simply use orthophotography information to best place the PLSS points, just as would the CoCiGIS. Due to the similar placement methodology, CoCiGIS would probably do a better job because of the member's local knowledge of PLSS control issues.
- 3) Source Packets
  - a) The group confirmed the CoCiGIS's responsibility of providing source documents in a "Packet Format". This packet will consist of source documents covering a two section geographic area as defined by the 1"=400' Sidwell map sheet. ASI will use best sources first, including original plats and development plans. Then, where plats and plans are not provided, ASI will use the 1"=100' Sidwell map sheets. Finally, where neither plats, plans or 1"=100' Sidwell map sheets are not provided, ASI will use the 1"=400' Sidwell map sheet.
  - b) CoCiGIS noted that reproducing source documents with a blueprint machine yields minor stretching. ASI noted that the minor stretching would not have an impact on accuracy of the parcel since source documents are georeferenced to control. Minor stretching should be removed through this process. However, the group noted that this issue would be addressed during the Pilot project.
  - c) CoCiGIS asked if ASI would need 2<sup>nd</sup> pages of plat and development plans that contain legal descriptions. ASI requested that CoCiGIS simply provide a copy of any legal description.
  - d) The group discussed the utility of providing .dwg files instead of hardcopies. After much debate, the group agreed that providing all hardcopy source documents would be the best scenario.
  - e) The group then discussed the necessity of implementing a simple source tracking methodology and toolset. ASI noted it normally uses a spreadsheet or database. CoCiGIS illustrated a spreadsheet containing information it wished to track during the project. ASI concurred. CoCiGIS noted it would implement the tracking tool as an Access database, so it may relate and use it in conjunction with ArcGIS tracking tools it had built.

- f) To facilitate good communication about source documents and special notes, ASI and CoCiGIS agreed to use a light colored highlighter. To denote that another better source document is to be used for a particular area, a line just inside of the area's boundary will be constructed (this means go get the other better source).
  - g) To assist ASI, CoCiGIS is to mark those source documents from which easements are to be captured.
- 4) Definition of Delivery Areas & Timeline
- a) ASI and CoCiGIS agreed that delivery areas would need to be configured to allow an even amount of parcels per delivery area. Given the goal of completing the county-wide project in 18 months with over 27K parcels to convert and to deliver an area every two months, an average of 3,000 parcels would need to comprise an area. CoCiGIS is to prepare a proposed delivery area scheme.
  - b) Unlike the Landbase Project, the delivery area schema for the Cadastral Project does not need to begin in a corner of the County however each area after the first must be contiguous to a previously delivered area.
- 5) Pilot Area
- a) A pilot project would be critical to the success of the project. The pilot project was agreed to cover 1 to 2 map sheets (2 to 4 sections), with approximately 200 parcels where possible.
  - b) All agreed the pilot area would need to be reflective of as many possible source document types as possible, target differing parcel densities, and aim to reveal as many problem types as possible.
  - c) The group agreed to plan to have the pilot project delivered in mid June, and to target a mid July pilot review meeting. A longer pilot review period may be needed to allow ample time up front to work out issues prior to full production.
- 6) Review of Methodology
- a) The group held a long discussion reviewing the methodology to be used to construct the cadastre. CoCiGIS wanted to clearly understand ASI's approach, and again revisit why it had selected the methodology it had.
    - i) The group discussed that, despite the best source data being used, this method may not produce the "prettiest picture" (e.g. parcels not matching the orthos). CoCiGIS noted it did not want aesthetics, but instead an accurate cadastre. ASI stated that decision makers would likely have questions about "why the parcels don't match the photos", and CoCiGIS noted that, like the remainder of the project, local education would have to be an important part of the project.
    - ii) CoCiGIS and ASI discussed the pros and cons to their methodology, and in the end concluded that the proposed methodology would likely yield the most accurate parcel fabric for the investment. Less accurate construction methods and the matching of parcels to the photos would lessen the integrity of the construction process and final product. Likewise, a completely COGO method would increase costs substantially with little gain.
    - iii) It was explained that ASI would have to input some of the metadata for the parcels as to how they were created (methodology). Because future adjustments to the parcel data are inevitable considering the number of PLSS points not yet located, individuals making the adjustments will need to know which parcels were created by the COGO method and which parcels were scanned. Parcels created by the COGO method will only shift location when PLS points are updated however their geometry will remain unchanged whereas digitized parcels may also experience geometry changes based on the more accurate data. These final metadata issues will be defined in the database design.
- 7) Database Schema
- a) Features. The group went through the list of features to be compiled by ASI.
  - b) Standards. The group preliminarily discussed standard decimal places/case/size for attributes/anno. All agreed that final adjustments would be made during the pilot project.
  - c) Format. The data format the parcels were to be delivered in was difficult to determine at this point. All agreed that CoCiGIS would discuss issues with ESRI, while ASI would also discuss it with their technical team. CoCiGIS placed a strong emphasis on implementing a data model that provides a path to the future ArcGIS Parcel model. CoCiGIS does not want to limit opportunities to exploit the geodatabase as the ArcParcel model becomes fully supported. The group downloaded the first draft of the ArcParcel data model from the ESRI website, and agreed to use it as a starting place for the database design.
- 8) Project Work Plan
- a) Throughout the day, the group noted several items that would best be implemented through a Project Work Plan.

- i) ASI to include a process/provisions for having deliverable areas completed before shipping subsequent areas...(i.e. have area 1 APPROVED before shipping 4 or 5)

9) General Questions

- a) A residual product of the conversion project may be raster images of the source documents (if ASI determines the best method is heads-up digitizing instead of tablet digitizing). CoCiGIS inquired into the possibility of obtaining this data, as it would be a wonderful dataset to have for reference purposes. ASI stated that, if scanning the source documents were the methodology implemented, providing the raster images to CoCiGIS would not be a problem.

10) Cadastral Action Items:

- a) CoCiGIS to forward Sidwell index sheets to ASI
- b) CoCiGIS to forward proposed deliverable areas for ASI's review and comment
- c) CoCiGIS to forward proposed Pilot area for ASI's review and comment (Approx 200 parcels)
- d) CoCiGIS to forward draft of Source Tracking database for ASI's review and comment
- e) ASI to revise project schedule
- f) CoCiGIS and ASI to review ArcParcel data model as beginning point for discussion
- g) CoCiGIS to look into changing Airline schedule to stop in Colorado Springs for July 16 Pilot Review Meeting with ASI – UPDATE, this idea has been abandoned, as additional costs and unknown pilot project schedule offer too many complications.

11) Land base Mapping Issues

- a) Contour Pricing and Scope. ASI and the County discussed pricing for additional contours potentially captures for use the FEMA DFIRM mapping project.
- b) ASI to forward signed Cadastral easement amendment to CoCiGIS.
- c) CoCiGIS to sign easement amendment and forward to ASI.
- d) The group reviewed the corrected sidewalks for area 2. There were some errors still present. ASI stated to perform the review and forward any errors to ASI for correction.
- e) The discussed the recompiled Area 2 utilities. ASI confirmed that the utilities delivered are ADDITIONAL points not captured previously.
- f) CoCiGIS inquired about ASI's intent to provide re-sampled orthos for use by CoCiGIS in the creation of MrSID imagery. ASI stated that CoCiGIS should inform ASI when an area's orthos are approved, and ASI would begin re-sampling for that area.
- g) ASI stated that silos for areas 1-4 are being compiled and are to be delivered. Silos will be delivered as part of the Area 5 planimetrics.

**Action Items**

?? See above notes.

**Upcoming Meetings**

?? April 5, 2001 @ 1:00 - Second Flood Conference Room City Hall

?? April 19, 2001 @ 1:00 - Second Flood Conference Room City Hall