

AGENDA

**MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE MEETING**

FRIDAY, May 21st, 2004, 10:30 A.M.

MCLEAN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPT

1. Call to Order

2. Attendance

3. Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes of the April 16th, 2004 meeting of the GIS Management Committee
- B. March, 2004 Financial Report

4. Items of Business

None.

5. Information / Discussion Items

- A. Cadastral Maintenance / Map Book
- B. Aerial Photography Presentation Dates
- C. Street Maintenance
- D. Intranet Map Server
- E. GPS Cost Estimates
- F. Other Discussion Items that May Arise

6. Adjournment

7. Executive Session

MINUTES

MCLEAN COUNTY GIS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING FRIDAY, April 16, 2004, 10:30 A.M. MCLEAN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Members Present

Phil Dick, Director - McLean County Building and Zoning; George Drye, Director of Engineering - City of Bloomington; Mike Hall, Director of Public Works - Town of Normal; Paul Russell, Director - McLean County Regional Planning Commission.

Members Absent

Bill Gamblin, E911 Administrator - McLean County E-911; Mike Ireland, Assessor - City of Bloomington Township.

Others Present

Gene Brown, Town of Normal Engineering; Doug Grovesteen, City of Bloomington Engineering; David Mather, GIS Coordinator - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Bill Jackson, GIS Programmer/Analyst - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; Leanne Brehob-Riley, GIS Specialist - McLean County Regional Planning Commission; J.R. Subbert - McLean County Assessor's Office - McLean County; Sarah Franks - McLean County E-911; Russ Warren - Farnsworth Group; Steve Sochotsky, GIS Specialist - Town of Normal; Mike Behary, County Planner - McLean County Building & Zoning; Juan Garcia, GIS Specialist - County of McLean; Kevin Kothe, Information Systems Engineer - City of Bloomington; John Hendershott - McLean County Health Department; Ken Emmons, City Planner - City of Bloomington.

1. Call to Order

The meeting commenced at 10:40 A.M.

2. Attendance

3. Consent Agenda

Approved as presented.

4. Items of Business

None.

5. Information / Discussion Items

A. GIS Recorders Fee / Intergovernmental Agreement Update

Mr. Russell stated that he had had several discussions with Mr. Zeunik and Mr. Lindberg regarding the GIS Recorders Fee and the GIS budget, and that he felt an eventual increase in the GIS Recorders Fee was likely, but the timing and the amount are yet to be determined. The local government equal contributions will need to be maintained for the foreseeable future. Mr. Hall inquired whether a future fee increase as discussed would allow for accrual of funds towards the next aerial photography flight. Mr. Russell was not certain whether there would be enough funds to cover the aerial photography project, as any fee increase would be subject to approval by the County Board, which may not grant the full amount identified in the cost justification study. Mr. Russell stated that the Regional Planning Commission was asked to use reserves generated from the three previous years to cover expenses in the coming budget, rather than budget for an increase in the GIS Recorders Fee for the coming fiscal year. The amount needed for the coming year was approximately \$90,000 and the reserves were approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Drye asked about the amount projected to be generated from the recorders fee in the coming year. He stated that if there was a high volume of recordings like the current year, then revenues would be positive, however if recordings dropped, revenues could potentially be negative. Mr. Mather stated that 46,579 documents was the estimated recorders document volume for the coming year, which would generate approximately \$90,000 dollars. He stated that the volume for 2003 was approximately 63,000 documents. The estimate for the GIS Recorders Fee increase study was based on an average of five years of recordings. The volume has ranged between 33,000 and 63,000 in that five year period. Mr. Drye stated that the current plan to delay increasing the GIS Recorders Fee would only work for one year, and that if the Fee was not increased, the GIS program would be in financial straits. Mr. Hall added that the program could be in a bind if the volume of recorded documents was to decrease for the coming year as well. In this event the Regional Planning Commission would need to ask for more money from the local governments.

Mr. Dick inquired as to how this might affect the Intergovernmental Agreement. Mr. Russell stated that there was an Executive Committee Meeting the following week, and that this topic was scheduled to be discussed. Mr. Russell stated that a change in the Intergovernmental Agreement would most likely not be necessary until an increase in the GIS Recorders Fee was going to be made. He stated that the amount of the IDOT contribution for the GIS Coordinators salary could be fine tuned, but that this was not a necessity, given that the Agreement simply stated that this was an anticipated revenue. Mr. Dick stated that he was concerned whether the responsibilities of the Regional Planning Commission outlined in the Intergovernmental Agreement were accurate. The Committee asked Mr. Mather to email the Intergovernmental Agreement to each member for their review, who would in turn forward any concerns they had to Mr. Russell prior to the Executive Committee meeting.

B. Cadastral Maintenance / Map Book

Ms. Brehob-Riley stated all missing annotation for the entire county had been added by Sidwell. Corrections and checking are currently underway for this annotation. Annotation formatting has also been completed, and preliminary work on the map book generator software had begun. GIS maintenance has not yet begun. Mr. Hall inquired as to the anticipated timeline for catching up the maintenance backlog. Mr. Mather stated that until Sidwell began the maintenance process

there was no way of estimating the time involved. A discussion ensued as to the extent of the backlog for the County and City of Bloomington Township. Mr. Mather reminded the Committee that some maintenance had been done recently by Mr. Olson for the City of Bloomington parcels, and at least 5000 parcels by Akanda in an earlier contract. All these updated parcels had been included in the data sent to Sidwell. Ms. Brehob-Riley stated that because Sidwell had been maintaining the County's data in a paper format, Sidwell should at least have a better handle on the amount of work ahead of them in catching up the digital maintenance for the County parcels.

C. Next Aerial Photography Acquisition

Mr. Mather informed the Committee that members of the Technical Committee had recently visited Sangamon County GIS and were given a presentation of the GIS program there. Sangamon County had contracted their last aerial photography fly-over through a company called EarthData. EarthData uses a completely digital process. There is no film involved. Processing and orthorectification are all done in a computer, and turn around time to delivery is about 90 days. In the examples the Technical Committee saw, building lean was completely absent. The resolution was slightly lower than that obtained by MCGIS for the urban area recently. Sangamon County acquired a one foot pixel for the entire county, whereas MCGIS acquired a six inch pixel in the urban area and a one foot pixel for the balance of the county.

Based on price estimates Mr. Mather gathered talking with an EarthData representative at ILGISA, the cost could be significantly less than anticipated for the entire county if the resolution was kept at one foot. Estimates were about \$150,000 vs. a current projected cost of \$250,000. The digital process also would avoid some of the problems encountered last time such as dust particle artifacts on the film based photo scans. The EarthData representative had stated that LiDAR was not needed to acquire contours for this process, since the presence of three digital cameras allowed them to generate contours automatically in post processing. Mr. Mather stated that EarthData indicated acquiring planimetrics would cost more than acquiring photography. The EarthData representative indicated that he was available to give a free presentation.

Mr. Dick expressed an interest in having a contractor give a presentation on the benefits of the traditional film-based process to give the Committee a balanced view in making its decisions. He stated a concern that the digital process may not be the best option. Mr. Mather stated that based on his talks with several contractors, the digital process was a new technology, of which not everyone yet had the capability, but the contractors saw more of their projects being digital in the future. Those who do not yet have digital capability can partner with a firm who does. Mr. Kothe stated that one potential draw back is that there is not yet an adopted standard for this digital process by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing. It was recommended that the EarthData representative and at least one other firm be contacted to make presentations to the GIS Committee. Mr. Drye stated that issues such as funding, resolution, and accuracy needed to be discussed.

D. Street Maintenance

Mr. Jackson stated that the quarterly maintenance had been finished for the streets and a copy had been distributed to E-911 as well as posted to the ArcIMS server.

E. Intranet Map Server

Mr. Jackson stated that several data sets and map services had been recently updated. The help menu had also been fixed.

F. GPS Cost Estimates

No new information was reported.

G. Other Discussion Items that May Arise

Mr. Mather stated that the GIS Committee should give its recommendations on the two attendees for the upcoming ESRI International Users Conference in California. The Committee selected Mr. Kothe and Mr. Garcia.

6. Adjournment

The next meeting of the GIS Committee will be held on May 21st, 10:30 A.M. at the McLean County Highway Department.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 A.M.

7. Executive Session

No executive session was held.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Mather
McLean County GIS Coordinator