

AGENDA

Please note new time and location

**MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY, August 22nd, 2003, 9:00 A.M.**

MCLEAN COUNTY Law & Justice Center Rm. 700

1. Call to Order

2. Attendance

3. Items of Business

- A. Cadastral Maintenance
 - 1. Sidwell Contract
 - 2. Status of Personnel Search
- B. Data Sharing Policy
 - 1. Census Requests
 - 2. Internet Requests/Graphics

4. Information / Discussion Items

- A. Minutes of the June 26th, 2003 meeting of the GIS Management Committee
- B. May, 2003 Financial Report
- C. Street Maintenance
- D. Intranet Map Server
- E. Digital Submittal of Plats
- F. Addressing Subcommittee
- G. GPS Acquisition Progress
- H. Other Discussion Items that May Arise

5. Adjournment

6. Executive Session

MINUTES

MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING THURSDAY, June 26th, 2003, 2:30 P.M. MCLEAN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Members Present

Paul Russell, Director - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Mike Hall, Director of Public Works - Town of Normal; Phil Dick, Director of Building and Zoning - McLean County; Mike Ireland, Assessor - City of Bloomington Township; George Drye, Director of Engineering and Water - City of Bloomington; Bill Gamblin, E911 Administrator - McLean County E-911.

Members Absent

Others Present

David Mather, GIS Coordinator - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Bill Jackson, GIS Programmer/Analyst - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Stephen Sochotsky, GIS Specialist - Town of Normal; Kevin Kothe, Information Systems Engineer - City of Bloomington; Connie Clifford - Assessor's Office - McLean County; Matt Hughes, GIS Specialist - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Kevin Walter - Assessor's Office - McLean County; David Dodson, Intern - Town of Normal; Troy Olson, GIS Specialist - City of Bloomington Engineering; John Mitchell, County Engineer - McLean County Highway Department; Robert Kahman, Supervisor of Assessments - McLean County Assessors Office; Sarah Franks, Addressing Technician - McLean County E-911; Terri Joyce, Records Management - City of Bloomington Township Assessor; Mark Hocking, Engineering Technician - City of Bloomington; Craig Nelson, IS Director - McLean County Information Services.

1. Call to Order

The meeting commenced at 2:40 P.M.

2. Attendance

3. Items of Business

A. Cadastral Maintenance

Mr. Mather stated that the technical committee had recommendations concerning the main items of business: organizational and management considerations, and staffing and contractor considerations. Mr. Mather stated that recently the question of ownership of the GIS database had surfaced, as well as the question of which governmental entity the GIS maintenance contract would be with. The technical committee recommended that the ownership of the GIS cadastral database remain with the GIS consortium. However, ownership of this database would not include the change record database, PIN numbers, and anything that is crucial to assessment. Mr. Mather stated that this had been a previous area of confusion for some. Mr. Mather stated that the technical committee was not attempting to propose a change to normal assessment

business practices. The technical committee further recommended that the contracting for GIS maintenance would be conducted through the Regional Planning Commission.

The technical committee recommended that the Sidwell Company be chosen to do the maintenance contract. Mr. Mather stated that Sidwell was charging more money per parcel. Mr. Mather stated that the estimates for annual cost for maintenance were \$35,000 per year for Akanda and \$42,000 per year for Sidwell, based on an average of 2,500 parcels added and removed on a yearly basis. Sidwell had proposed to continue the online change records database, PIN assignment, legal descriptions, and everything pertinent to the assessors office functions. Mr. Mather stated that for these assessment type services it would be a smoother transition to select Sidwell.

The technical committee recommended that the GIS Specialist position be immediately filled. This GIS Specialist would go through training, begin to take on maintenance responsibilities, help with the training of a second GIS Specialist, so that maintenance could eventually be brought back within the consortium. Mr. Mather stated that the current maintenance crisis was due to the fact that only one person had been hired for maintenance. He reminded the management committee that it had been known and stated multiple times through the years that two or three people would be needed to perform cadastral maintenance. He stated that if there had been two Specialists performing cadastral maintenance, the loss of one employee would have been easier to take, because the remaining Specialist would still know the maintenance process and be available to train the next candidate.

Mr. Drye asked for more detail concerning what services would be contracted. Mr. Mather stated that the contractor would help the consortium catch up with the maintenance backlog, and continue regular maintenance until the consortium could get a GIS Specialist hired to begin taking over some of the maintenance responsibilities again. Mr. Mather envisioned sending less and less work to the contractor and doing more in house as time progresses.

Mr. Hall inquired when the contractor would actually take possession of the data set, and whether they proposed to work with our database as currently structured, or were proposing to maintain it some other format. Mr. Mather stated that Sidwell was willing to maintain the dataset as-is. They had initially proposed to maintain the dataset in a different format than it was currently maintained in. Mr. Mather stated that there was some history behind that suggestion, and it involved their previous maintenance of many geodatabases with line topology, but not polygon topology. Mr. Mather stated that Sidwell had also agreed to maintain the past layer for the proposed price.

Mr. Hall inquired how many parcels would be charged for in a simple split procedure. Mr. Mather stated that Sidwell was proposing a different parcel count method than Akanda. Sidwell was proposing to charge for parcels added and removed. For example, splitting one parcel into two would result in a parcel count of three: the original parcel, and the two resulting parcels.

There was some discussion whether the contract would be time and materials or per parcel. Mr. Ireland stated that traditionally Sidwell had charged for time and materials and may continue to

do so. Mr. Hall stated that he would not agree to that unless there was a cap on the contracted price.

Mr. Drye inquired who would review the work of the contractor. Mr. Mather stated that a GIS Specialist needed to be hired for QC. He stated that initially members of the technical committee could assist with QC.

Mr. Dick inquired whether there would be any cost savings with Sidwell if both the paper map and digital were maintained in parallel. Mr. Mather stated that this was an interesting question and one that had not been thoroughly addressed. The consortium expected Sidwell to produce their map book at the end of the year, and to produce its own map book for the City of Bloomington. Mr. Mather inquired whether Sidwell currently had all the information necessary to produce the forthcoming Sidwell book. There was some discussion amongst the management committee as to when the Sidwell books would be issued. Mr. Kahman stated that the production schedule was based on the assessment cycle, and that acquisition of new books was simply a matter of requesting them by a certain date. Mr. Mather stated that ultimately the cost of maintaining digitally would cut the cost of the contract in half. Mr. Kahman stated that he did not believe Sidwell expected to maintain the paper maps any longer. Mr. Ireland stated that the paper maps were not hand drawn and had not been so for some time. Sidwell had been maintaining the line work for the paper maps as vector graphics. He further stated that it was likely that if they did produce more map books, they would do so from the GIS data, and not their rasterized vector graphics.

Mr. Russell inquired how the missing annotation in the current dataset would be handled. Mr. Mather stated that Akanda had submitted a bid for that service, and Sidwell had not because of time constraints. Mr. Mather stated that \$50,000 had been set aside from the original contract for the map book, and this service could be paid for out of those funds. Mr. Mitchell asked for clarification concerning the missing annotation issue. Mr. Mather stated that parcel and lot dimensions were missing in the database, and in the annotation layer. Mr. Mather stated that these omissions were not caught in the QC process. Mr. Mitchell inquired whether Akanda should be held to back-filling the dimensions they omitted. Mr. Hall stated that that would require a separate contract because the data had been officially accepted. The management committee was interested in getting a price from Sidwell for this service. Mr. Ireland stated that this had been discussed with Sidwell but it was difficult for them to bid on the service without knowing the volume of missing dimensions. Mr. Mather stated that Akanda had bid on an estimated 10,000 database and annotation items to back fill. Mr. Drye inquired whether the back filling of dimensions would be done using the Sidwell books and whether it should be assumed that the Sidwell dimensions were correct. Mr. Ireland stated that the Sidwell dimensions were very accurate because they were drawn based on deeds rather than plats. Mr. Ireland stated that he did not want to pay Akanda to copy Sidwell dimensions. The committee agreed that Sidwell should be able to provide this service at a lower cost than Akanda. Mr. Gamblin stated that the time for completion of the back fill process should also be considered.

Mr. Hall brought up the question of whether maintenance should be an in-house process at all, or whether the contractor should just perform the maintenance in perpetuity. Mr. Mather stated that using a contractor for the maintenance services was not really in keeping with the consortium

goals of being a self-sufficient GIS. Mr. Kothe stated that digital submittal process was expected to improve the maintenance effort, and that a large number of the parcels that are added to the cadastral database could be facilitated through digital submittal. He further stated that the contracting company be utilized to help with overflow maintenance work and for the more difficult non-platted parcel changes. Mr. Kothe stated that he would not expect to be charged the same amount for Sidwell to do maintenance with digital submittals because they are already drawn in state plane coordinates. Mr. Mather stated that a price per parcel for digitally submitted plats had not been obtained from Sidwell.

Mr. Kothe expressed concerns over handing the cadastral database entirely over to the contractor and not hiring in-house staff to maintain it. Because simultaneous updates cannot be made to the cadastral database, making changes would be very difficult. For example, adding a zoning layer to the database could be very difficult to do if the dataset was entirely in the hands of the contractor. In-house maintenance staff would provide for local control of the database and flexibility to make changes and additions when needed. Mr. Russell stated that Sidwell had a plan in place to work around some of these problems in the short-term.

Mr. Hall inquired concerning turn around time for the maintenance process. Mr. Mather stated that Sidwell had proposed a 24 hour turn around on PINs, two weeks on line work changes, and one month for delivery of the GIS database.

Mr. Dick stated that the County was looking at the possibility of making the cadastral database and its maintenance a function of the assessor rather than the consortium and whether this would simplify the process. He stated that this approach would not require an intergovernmental agreement through the Planning Commission, but would entail a contract solely with the Assessor's Office. Mr. Drye stated that the GIS consortium is where the cadastral data originated and he believed the dataset should stay in the hands of the consortium. Mr. Ireland stated that he believed a solution could be reached. He further stated that the workflow relationship that the consortium members had with Sidwell need not be interrupted even if the financial end of the contract was handled through the planning commission.

Mr. Dick stated that he thought there was a trend in Assessor's Offices taking over maintenance of cadastral GIS databases, and that ultimately the Assessor's Office should have the staff in-house to perform this function by itself. He further stated that the Assessors office did not need some of the layers that the rest of the consortium needed to perform its functions. These he felt should be maintained and paid for separately. Mr. Hall responded that the idea from the beginning was cooperation and that all the consortium members had participated in the cost of the cadastral development project. Mr. Ireland stated that itemizing services had been discussed with Sidwell, and that where appropriate, various layers such as easements, being maintained by Sidwell could be billed out separately to different entities. Mr. Hall stated that maintaining the contract through the consortium provided an easy mechanism for cost sharing and input into the project.

Mr. Ireland stated that most of the successful GISs in the country were functioning at an enterprise level. He stated that our current membership should be increased to include all the municipalities in the county, all townships, all the school districts and various other agencies so that we could function on an enterprise level. Mr. Russell raised the concern that while our

intergovernmental agreement allows for other units of government to be added, most will not join if they can purchase the few items they need from our GIS at minimal cost. Mr. Ireland responded that that might be good incentive to quit selling the data, so that other governments would join.

Mr. Gamblin stated that the consortium had made a commitment to deliver a good product, and that in order to maintain credibility they needed to make good on that commitment. Mr. Russell stated that a key issue to understand was that in the GIS needs assessment survey performed by Connie Wester, it was clearly stated that two or three people would be needed to maintain the cadastral layer properly.

Mr. Mather summarized the two separate courses of action being proposed. The first is that the cadastral dataset be handed over to the County Assessors office to maintain, as introduced by Mr. Dick. The second is that the cadastral layer continue to be maintained by the consortium, and that the Assessors office continue to receive from Sidwell all the elements necessary to the business of assessment, as recommended by the technical committee. Mr. Mather stated that the first proposal was not in keeping with the original goals of the consortium, nor with the fact that each entity in the consortium had contributed funds to the development of the dataset. Mr. Hall stated that when the consortium was started, the consortium membership considered the cadastral layer a basic informational layer in the GIS pertinent to all the members, and the product was specified in a manner to meet needs of all the members, including those of assessment. Mr. Hall stated that all the members would not be comfortable relinquishing control of the cadastral layer to the Assessor's Office, because they would not be assured of deriving all the necessary benefits from they layer in the same way they could if they had control over the layer.

Mr. Kahman inquired whether the ability to perform basic business processes would be impaired if the GIS was not functioning. Both Mr. Drye and Mr. Hall replied that their business processes would be impaired. Mr. Hall explained that certain other systems in the Town of Normal were dependent on the GIS. Mr. Kahman stated that the cadastral layer was critical to his business processes and the ability to assess taxes. He further stated that he believed getting Sidwell involved in the maintenance contract would help him transition towards the ultimate goal of the consortium for in-house maintenance. Mr. Kahman asked Mr. Ireland whether the staffs at the assessors offices could ultimately maintain the cadastral layer. Mr. Ireland stated that in order to maintain the integrity of the GIS fabric a special skill set was needed that the assessment staffs would not be able to provide. He stated however that the assessment office staff could play monitoring and auditing roles for the cadastral layer. Mr. Kahman stated that he would be happy to see Sidwell get the contract, so he could continue all his current business processes, with the future goal in mind for self-sufficiency of the GIS.

Mr. Hall again raised the issue of allowing the contractor to do maintenance and not attempting to do so in-house. He was concerned with the difficulty the consortium had experienced in keeping staff. Mr. Ireland added that allowing a contractor to do the maintenance alleviates the need for retraining and rehiring when staff leave.

Mr. Drye stated his concern that the GIS data needs to stay with the consortium and be maintained by the consortium. The contractor should be utilized to help the GIS consortium back to a place where it could perform maintenance in-house. He stated that he would not want to see the consortium get on a crutch they could not get off of. Mr. Drye further proposed that the contractual help be facilitated through the Regional Planning Commission until the consortium could provide the service needed for all involved. Mr. Kahman stated that he did not care who held the contract for cadastral maintenance as long as they had continued access to Sidwell's Internet tools.

Mr. Hall stated that two staff members would cost more than the contracted price being proposed by either company. He felt it was difficult to justify the hiring of staff to perform maintenance in-house. Mr. Mather reminded the committee that the GIS Specialist position must be replaced to provide for quality control of the product. He stated that even if the maintenance was done by a contractor, there was still a need for a person to coordinate the cadastral maintenance, and receive and distribute the data among the consortium members.

The general question of funding sources for this contract arose within the committee. Mr. Ireland stated that he had \$10,000 set aside for map maintenance that he could make available. Mr. Kahman stated that due to his current contract with Sidwell, in effect these services were already being paid for. He stated that he could use the money he had already allocated for the Sidwell contract and just tell them to begin maintenance in digital rather than paper format. Mr. Kahman proposed that the contract continue to be with the Assessors office at this time, and that new arrangements could be made for the following year.

The committee agreed that Sidwell needed to make their proposal more technical and specific as to the services being offered. Mr. Drye raised the concern that terms needed to be included in the contract to specify what Sidwell would be able to do with the data in terms of redistribution and sales. He questioned whether Sidwell intended to make money selling products derived from our data. Mr. Mather stated that the consortium ultimately would like to sell the map book.

A motion was made by Mr. Dick to fund the GIS maintenance through Sidwell's current contractual channels with the County Assessor and the City of Bloomington Township Assessor, and look at new contractual arrangements at the beginning of the year. The motion carried. The committee recommended that the process for rehiring the vacant GIS Specialist position be begun immediately. The committee further recommended that Sidwell be contacted concerning contractual concerns that had been raised, and the committee would reconvene in July to discuss the results.

Information / Discussion Items

A. Minutes

Received as presented.

B. February Financial Report

Received as presented.

The following items were not able to be discussed due to insufficient time.

C. Street Maintenance / Street Map

D. Intranet Map Server

E. Digital Submittal of Plats

F. Addressing Subcommittee

G. GPS Acquisition Progress

H. Other Discussion Items that May Arise

No further items were discussed at this time.

5. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

6. Executive Session

No executive session was held.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Mather,
MCRPC GIS Coordinator