

AGENDA

**MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, Oct. 18th, 2002, 10:30 A.M.**

MCLEAN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

1. Call to Order

2. Administrative Matters

- a. Review of the Minutes from the Sept. 20th, 2002 meeting of the GIS Committee
- b. Financial Report

3. Priority Projects

- a. Cadastral Mapping
- b. Aerial Photography
- c. Intranet Map Server
- d. Digital Submittal of Plats
- e. County Voting Precinct Maps

4. Addressing Subcommittee

5. Status of County GIS Grant Application

6. GPS Acquisition Progress

7. Other Matters of Business or Discussion that May Arise

8. Next Meeting

9. Adjournment

10. Executive Session

MINUTES

MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

FRIDAY, Sept. 20th, 2002, 9:00 A.M.

MCLEAN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Members Present

Paul Russell, Director - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; John Mitchell, County Engineer - McLean County Highway Department, George Drye, Director of Engineering and Water - City of Bloomington; Mike Hall, Director of Public Works - Town of Normal; Mike Ireland, Assessor - City of Bloomington Township; Bob Kahlman, Supervisor of Assessments - McLean County; Bill Gamblin, E911 Administrator - McLean County E-911.

Members Absent

None.

Others Present

David Mather, GIS Coordinator - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Phil Dick, Director of Building and Zoning - McLean County; Troy Olson, GIS Specialist - City of Bloomington Engineering; Kevin Kothe, Information Systems Engineer - City of Bloomington; Bill Jackson, GIS Programmer/Analyst - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Stephen Sochotsky, GIS Specialist - Town of Normal; Mike Behary, County Planner - McLean County; Kevin Walter - Assessor's Office - McLean County.

1. Call to Order

The meeting commenced at 10:30 a.m.

2. Administrative Matters

a. Review of the Minutes from the Sept, 20th 2002 meeting of the GIS Committee

No changes to the minutes were noted, minutes were approved.

b. Financial Report

No questions or comments on the financial report.

Priority Projects

3a. Cadastral Mapping / Transition from Sidwell to GIS

Mr. Kahman stated the need for a County GIS liaison facilitator. He indicated that the County department heads need to impress upon senior management the need for planning information Services (IS) contingency funds beyond the yearly budget, that it goes back to how their committee and budget systems are set up and is related to Homeland Security. Mr Kahman advised that internally the group needs to decide what they are going to do, need to educate senior management, senior elected officials, and the County Board. Further, there is a need to work in the long term and that the County needs a vision person that can say; “here is a project, how are we going to make this happen.”

Mr. Kahman indicated that the County moves slowly and pragmatically and they as department heads have to work within the system. Further, until the Sidwell coverage was complete for the City of Bloomington Township there was no impetus for discussion. Mr. Kahman suggested that it is good that Mr. Ireland is no longer sending updates to Sidwell; now they have to ask what do we need in terms of money, hardware and software, in order to become an active member in the GIS process.

Mr. Kahman suggested that there may not be any problem providing McLean County Regional Planning Commission (MCRPC) with the \$100k it pays to Sidwell, after the transition, since it might be cheaper for MCRPC to hire staff than the County, though a justification, agreement about deliverables, warranty, security issues etc. would be required.

Mr. Russell indicated that he had not envisioned that the funds the County now pays for Sidwell maintenance would go to the MCRPC, and the only way this is likely to happen is if the County and the Commission determine it to be in their best interest to do.

Mr Kahman stated that a lot of people in the County government are interested in GIS and the need is going to grow exponentially once people start using it. Mr. Kahman stated that his office would work with the GIS Coordinator on cadastral needs.

County mapping requests vs. liaison role

Mr. Mather made the distinction between a County staff person handling mapping requests vs. a County GIS liaison with MCRPC. Mr. Hall indicated that since early planning of GIS a need for person at the County was discussed.

Mr. Dick suggested that cadastral maintenance and County internal coordination between the departments are two separate issues. Mr. Russell agreed, noting that the County would benefit from an internal coordinator regardless of the maintenance issue, but that perhaps a County GIS coordinator could also assist with cadastral maintenance.

Mr. Mitchell advised that getting someone on staff with the County is not likely to happen until the 2004 budget. Mr. Ireland suggested the County consider retraining existing staff. Further, GIS requires long term personnel, and is a management as well as a budgetary issue.

Mr. Mitchell advised that it's easier for MCRPC and Normal and Bloomington to hire someone than the County, since they are dealing with 7-8 different departments, some elected some appointed officials, and need for board approval.

Mr. Dick stated that everything happens at the committee level and there has to be vision. Furthermore, County department heads need to take the opportunity to talk with each other.

3. b. Aerial Photography

Mr. Mather stated that he has yet to purchase a DVD writer and per a GIS committee suggestion, he investigated what it would cost to have an outside company create the DVD copies. The costs for reproducing 300 DVD's was estimated at \$10,000. Based on the high cost for the reproduction Mr. Mather advised that the work be accomplished in-house. Mr. Mather presented a prototype DVD index for all photography featuring township, range and section with corresponding DVD number. A shapefile map photography index will also be distributed.

3. c. Intranet Map Server / Training

Mr. Mather stated that he recommended pushing back IMS training several months in order to complete the County Clerk's project for users to become familiar with the cadastral data following final delivery.

3. d. Digital submittals

Mr. Mather advised that he would provide notes from the digital submittal meeting to anyone who would like to see them and that the engineering firms agreed to begin providing digital submittals.

4. Re-establishment of addressing subcommittee

The general consensus among the group members was that re-establishment of the addressing subcommittee is a good idea.

5. Potential GIS grant project

Mr. Russell advised that IDOT was sponsoring a \$100k GIS grant for each County in the State. Mr. Mather advised that any proposal must fit into the area of Transportation Planning, including; GIS planning, system development and implementation, data development, data conversion, data collection, or custom applications etc. Mr. Mather advised that the topic was

discussed at a previous GIS Technical Committee meeting and that attributing the streets centerline data, i.e., adding data speed limits, school zones, lane width etc., was suggested. Further, there was a need to determine what data is required for transportation models currently used and what software is required. After some further discussion, it was concluded that the County would apply for the grant to assist with enhancing the County's participation in the regional GIS.

6. Executive Session

No items to discuss.

7. Other Matters of Business or Discussion that May Arise

GIS Mapping Requests

Mr. Kahman asked what MCRPC was doing to cover costs for GIS requests by the County. Mr. Russell stated that it would depend upon how significant the request is. Mr. Kahman asked if the committee had a mechanism in place to tell people in the County who are requesting GIS products that additional costs may be associated for things such as time and materials, because there is a perception at the County that MCRPC is the county's mapper and that they are already giving MCRPC sufficient funds for these requests.

Mr. Russell advised that funding received does not cover these types of costs. The funding is basically for operations to support the regional GIS system, including people, equipment and software, to maintain and expand the GIS system.

Mr. Kahman asked the committee members if it was their understanding that MCRPC would not provide mapping services upon requests by GIS participants. Mr. Hall indicated that he does not expect anything more than the GIS base data and that he would not expect MCRPC to produce, for example sewer maps, for the Town of Normal. Mr. Ireland used the example of Sidwell who provides the basic mapping product but charges for additional information requests. Mr. Kahman suggested a need for a County mapping department that can actually have a budget. Mr. Dick suggested that costing project requests using time and materials may help bridge the gap.

Mr. Kahman indicated that delivering one or two products gratis can lead to misunderstanding. Mr. Russell explained that the staff welcomes the opportunity to demonstrate the system's capabilities to meet the participant's needs, and that up until the recently the requests had been more manageable. He also indicated that the main issue is not the cost, although the cost of materials can be significant, but rather the time required because of the existing workload.

GPS Base Station

Mr. Hall advised that the funds allocated for the GPS base station needs to be spent or will be lost. He advised that he was in the process of working with a vendor to secure a radio frequency.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the GIS Committee will be held on Oct 18th, 10:30 am at the McLean County Highway Department.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Mather,
MCRPC GIS Coordinator