

January 2003 AIMS Coordinators Meeting Minutes  
January, 16 2003

Agenda

- Announcements
- Planimetric Data Updates
- Addressing and Centerline Discussion
- Technology Demonstration – Tablet PC & Field Address Verification

**Announcements**

None

**Planimetric Data Updates – Shannon Porter**

An update of the current status of the 2003 planimetric data update project was given. The request for proposal is currently open for firms to respond to and will close next week. At that time, proposals will be evaluated, a firm selected, and data updates would begin.

An overview was given about the selection process for which areas and data to update.

The current proposal suggests updating the county-wide aerial imagery every two years. AIMS would alternate between and orthophoto and a simple rectified image in each of the update cycles.

See the planimetric project website at [http://aims.jocoks.com/PROJECTS/PlaniUpdates/planimetric\\_2003\\_updates.htm](http://aims.jocoks.com/PROJECTS/PlaniUpdates/planimetric_2003_updates.htm) for more information and documents regarding this project

**Addressing and Centerline Discussion – Matt Wennstedt**

The attachment at the end of this document was handed out in the meeting prior to this discussion.

This topic was a discussion and forum for providing feedback based on the current addressing and centerline processes that are going on within various entities in Johnson County.

The text highlighted below are the topics of discussion taken from the handout from the meeting. Regular formatted text is the comments, feedback and action items on these issues.

*Maintenance Responsibilities - Are streets added into the centerline dataset “early” enough (driveable vs dispatchable)? Could we better coordinate centerline maintenance efforts between MED-ACT, cities, 911, and AIMS (streetinfo)?*

Suggestion was made that once a street can be navigated it be made dispatchable even if it is not yet a public street. A brief overview of the plat approval process

and flow was given by the County Clerk's office. It was recommended that the goal should be to add centerlines once they have been graded and make them dispatchable at that point. Grading permit requests should trigger the addition of the street to the centerline file. Waterone would like to see the street at the time of the plat approval process and implied this would likely be the case for all utility companies.

*Cul-de-sacs containing the incorrect address range with the low/high being in the incorrect order. Lenexa would like to see this changed for their dispatch application.*

Issues arise when "from" address numbers are higher than "to" address number on cul-de-sacs. This is creating a software error for Lenexa's dispatching software. It was noted that there is inconsistency in the centerline file of how cul-de-sacs are numbered. Historically, arc direction went to the increasing address number. This is not necessarily the case anymore. There was resistance against assigning empty (0) ranges for one side of the street. The outcome is that there needs to be more discussion on the approach to assigning cul-de-sac ranges.

*GeoComm and ECC have requested that nodes be placed at intersections of city boundaries. Currently nodes exist only at intersections. What are the implications of such a change? In the past such a change has been resisted. What are the reasons for this resistance? How can we resolve the needs of all users? (Similarly, consider placing nodes where zip code changes.)*

AIMS indicated that there has been resistance to this proposal in the past by a couple of cities. At the time of discussion, there were no objections or known issues to following through with this action. The only noted issue was the need to review street name changes between grids occurring at the city boundary versus a major intersection. Most participants indicated this change would benefit their dispatch systems.

*What are the issues that cause Overland Park not to use the AIMS centerline (node attribute table for ???, cul-de-sac cartography)? Do other entities share these same issues? Does the centerline need to be enhanced to accomodate these needs/uses?*

Overland Park uses an enhanced centerline file that includes individual directional arcs for divided streets, enhanced annotation, and a node attribute table. At this time, they are not notifying the County of any discrepancies they find between their centerline file and the County's centerline file. Overland Park recognizes the benefit to getting on a single file and is exploring this possibility.

*Notification of updates to the centerline coverage. Currently we "notify" the ECC (files for import into their CAD), GeoComm (shapefile), I/CAD map roll process. Should we establish a better method (generic, enterprise) for tracking changes and distributing this info (e.g., perhaps a web app dedicated to presenting changed centerline data - both in a map and tabular form)?*

All existing notification processes in place will continue. There is interest in seeing centerline changes both spatial and tabular as updates are made. This could be delivered through the internet.

*Sheriff dispatches to Spring Hill in Miami County, thus we need to expand the centerline to cover this extent. How does this impact users of the centerline (cartography, dispatch)?*

No concerns about doing this were raised

*Adoption and use of addressing standards*

No objections were raised to the adoption or use of the current standards. The issue raised was that the standards did not carry any weight if they weren't enforceable.

*Johnson County Emergency Communications (ECC) Department has proposed that they are willing to review all address assignments before they are finalized.*

There is agreement that having an address reviewer (e.g. ECC, AIMS, etc...) validate adherence to standards before the addresses are assigned would be in everyone's best interest.

It was reiterated that a goal be established to have address proposals submitted with the plat proposal so that each reviewing entity would have the opportunity to ensure compliance with the addressing standards and ensure compatibility with their existing systems.

*On going efforts of hundred block assignment. How best to distribute so that used for address assignment throughout the county (web).*

No concerns were raised over the global assignment of 100 blocks for remaining areas in the County.

*How can we work with Shawnee, Mission Hills, and Prairie Village to establish their address point files? (All other cities and unincorporated parts of the county will be in "good" shape by mid-February.)*

Shawnee indicated that they do maintain address points on paper. It was suggested that utility information (water, sewer, gas, etc...) be considered as a basis for establishing address points.

*Is the AIMS/TRSmith vision of thin-client (web or terminal server app) address assignment application the "right" vision? The general idea is that all persons assigning addresses in the County (i.e., at each of the various cities, and the County Clerk) would*

*use this app to "propose" a new address assignment. These "proposed" addresses would be reviewed by an "address certification committee" (consisting of persons from the ECC and ...) within XX hours and either approved (i.e., committed to the address point database) or rejected (with suggestions for modification). The app would provide tools to assist the end-user with making good assignments (e.g., addressing standards would be integrated into the app, view/query neighboring address points, check against MSAG data, ). How can we best formulate the details of this vision (i.e., defining requirements for an app), get buy-in for the vision/app from all players, and finally develop and deploy the app? Can we learn from the experiences of other Counties? How can we integrate an ongoing field verification/update effort with address assignment? (A related request that we have heard about is to enable ECC (and others) to review street names on a plat when the plat is in a preliminary stage.)*

The first issue raised was that without the ability to enforce policies/standards, no process, no matter how efficient, would succeed in forcing adherence to the addressing standards. Enforcement would take place in the form of a county ordinance. An application prototype would be beneficial to demonstrating the abilities and processes to the policy makers. It was suggested that the County investigate the feasibility of being the address assigner for the entire County. There were no objections to AIMS pushing ahead with an approach and tapping various entities for resources provided that there are some tangible, achievable goals.

### **Technology Demonstration – Tablet PC & Field Address Verification**

Jerry Swingle & Russ Schuster

A demonstration of the technical capabilities of the tablet pc was given by Jerry Swingle. Russ Schuster demonstrated an application AIMS is using in the field to verify address locations.

Attachment A.

Handout given to meeting attendees prior to addressing and centerline discussion

### **Address & Centerline Topics for Discussion**

#### **Centerline**

- Maintenance Responsibilities - Are streets added into the centerline dataset “early” enough (driveable vs dispatchable)? Could we better coordinate centerline maintenance efforts between MED-ACT, cities, 911, and AIMS (streetinfo)?
- Cul-de-sacs containing the incorrect address range with the low/high being in the incorrect order. Lenexa would like to see this changed for their dispatch application.
- GeoComm and ECC have requested that nodes be placed at intersections of city boundaries. Currently nodes exist only at intersections. What are the implications of such a change? In the past such a change has been resisted. What are the reasons for this resistance? How can we resolve the needs of all users? (Similarly, consider placing nodes where zip code changes.)
- What are the issues that cause Overland Park not to use the AIMS centerline (node attribute table for ???, cul-de-sac cartography??)? Do other entities share these same issues? Does the centerline need to be enhanced to accommodate these needs/uses?
- Notification of updates to the centerline coverage. Currently we “notify” the ECC (files for import into their CAD), GeoComm (shapefile), I/CAD map roll process. Should we establish a better method (generic, enterprise) for tracking changes and distributing this info (e.g., perhaps a web app dedicated to presenting changed centerline data - both in a map and tabular form)?
- Sheriff dispatches to Spring Hill in Miami County, thus we need to expand the centerline to cover this extent. How does this impact users of the centerline (cartography, dispatch)?

#### **Address Assignment/Addressing Standards**

- Adoption and use of addressing standards
- Johnson County Emergency Communications (ECC) Department has proposed that they are willing to review all address assignments before they are finalized.

- On going efforts of hundred block assignment. How best to distribute so that used for address assignment throughout the county (web).

### **Address Points**

- How can we work with Shawnee, Mission Hills, and Prairie Village to establish their address point files? (All other cities and unincorporated parts of the county will be in “good” shape by mid-February.)
  - Is the AIMS/TRSmith vision of thin-client (web or terminal server app) address assignment application the “right” vision? The general idea is that all persons assigning addresses in the County (i.e., at each of the various cities, and the County Clerk) would use this app to "propose" a new address assignment. These "proposed" addresses would be reviewed by an "address certification committee" (consisting of persons from the ECC and ...) within XX hours and either approved (i.e., committed to the address point database) or rejected (with suggestions for modification). The app would provide tools to assist the end-user with making good assignments (e.g., addressing standards would be integrated into the app, view/query neighboring address points, check against MSAG data, ). How can we best formulate the details of this vision (i.e., defining requirements for an app), get buy-in for the vision/app from all players, and finally develop and deploy the app? Can we learn from the experiences of other Counties? How can we integrate an ongoing field verification/update effort with address assignment? (A related request that we have heard about is to enable ECC (and others) to review street names on a plat when the plat is in a preliminary stage.)
- In the interim before such an app is built/deployed, how can we work with the cities for whom AIMS/Sheriff has verified/updated address points (Spring Hill, Gardner, Edgerton, DeSoto, Lake Quivira, Merriam, Mission, Mission Woods, Westwood, Westwood Hills, Roeland Park, Fairway) to improve/keep up-to-date their address points? (County Clerk will handle unincorporated JoCo)***