

# **AIMS Coordinators Meeting Minutes**

## **February 19, 2004**

### **Johnson County Transit Building**

#### **Announcements**

##### **Planimetric/Orthophotography Update**

Shannon Porter announced that the first planimetric project area will be delivered from M.J. Harden to AIMS next week with the rest of the updated project areas coming in early March. A question was asked about printing the new orthophotography – sometimes there are missing streaks of data. Shannon recommended upgrading the windows print engine (preferred) or using ArcPress as opposed to using the postscript print engine. Furthermore, ESRI recommends decreasing the print quality setting, increasing RAM, or decreasing the area you are trying to print.

#### **Migration to Geodatabase/SDE**

##### **Overview of Strategy**

Steve Yoder discussed AIMS' past and future plans for the migration of coverages (file-based data) to the geodatabase/SDE model. In the past, AIMS kept data primarily in coverage format and built applications around this. Eventually, AIMS began to use some feature classes and SDE layers in a limited capacity. Currently, AIMS has begun to maintain and edit most datasets in SDE while pushing them out to coverage format so that applications can still run. Future migration includes centerline and planimetric editing in SDE as well as maintaining imagery in SDE.

To view a diagram that depicts AIMS' migration to enterprise geodatabase, see <http://aims.jocogov.org/resources/mtgnotes/cov2entgeodbmigrationplan.pdf>

##### **Migration to Geodatabase – Phase II**

Keith Shaw discussed which coverages AIMS will migrate to geodatabase as well as the editing, publishing, and conversion procedures involved. Currently, all files without annotation have been migrated over to geodatabase while those with annotation are still being maintained as coverages. Further research is being done to determine the best way to migrate these coverages over as pushing annotation back into coverage format is difficult. It was stressed that, in the future, AIMS will no longer be editing in coverage format although will continue to push coverages out to those who request them. Keith then explained the editing process in ArcMap. Editor listeners are used to add new fields that include, although it may vary between feature classes, a unique ID, date added, date modified, last user, and an X and Y coordinate. A demonstration of the editor listener was shown in ArcMap. Keith concluded by discussing the data maintenance table and publishing websites to track data editing as well as the conversion process between data types. Two separate servers are used to edit and then store the published data.

To view the Powerpoint presentation on this topic, see  
<http://aims.jocogov.org/resources/mtgnotes/migrationtogeodatabase.ppt>

### **Ongoing Planimetric Edits in the Geodatabase**

Shannon Porter discussed the advantages and disadvantages of AIMS doing additional planimetric edits in-house. Advantages would include an increased update frequency and a greater extent of area being updated. Additional sources of information could be used to enhance this. A disadvantage would be decreased accuracy, and would this matter to those who use the data? Three pilot projects have been established to test the process. First, 8 square miles in De Soto were selected to update building footprints where buildings needed to be added, changed or deleted. A second project involves comparing an area of building footprints edited in-house with that of M.J. Harden updates in the same area. The third project would be gathering point files of building permits collected by the county appraiser and generating building footprints from those. Shannon then showed examples of planimetric editing and some of the challenges. Challenges to editing in a geodatabase include exporting back to tiled coverages for legacy applications and exporting to DXF while retaining attributes. Practical implications such as mixing sources and maintenance distribution were also discussed.

To view the Powerpoint presentation on this topic, see  
[http://aims.jocogov.org/resources/mtgnotes/geodatabase\\_planiediting.ppt](http://aims.jocogov.org/resources/mtgnotes/geodatabase_planiediting.ppt)

### **Discussion of Data Access and Transfer Issues**

Steve Yoder and Jerry Swingle led a discussion of how each organization stores their geographic data currently, the plans for maintaining this data in the future, connectivity issues, access to AIMS data stored in a DBMS/SDE and ongoing maintenance of geographic datasets. Each organization responded briefly to the issues outlined in the following document

<http://aims.jocogov.org/resources/mtgnotes/dataaccessandtransfer.pdf>

### ***Overland Park***

Overland Park stores/maintains their datasets in a variety of formats including shapefile, coverage and personal geodatabase. They are waiting on AIMS to lead the transition from coverages to SDE. They are moving to SQL Server and SDE for future maintenance. They have thought about using AIMS data on-the-fly but are concerned about connection reliability. Jerry emphasized the fiber connection Olathe has and that cities would have to work together to get on this connection; a potential ATM hot site for backup to ICAD could possibly be used as well. They would like the property and centerline datasets to remain local but less critical datasets they don't mind not having locally. As far as reciprocation, they have no problem giving AIMS direct access to pull from them. They want to be able to directly edit their data. They did want some more clarification on application issues and account log-ins etc.

***Lenexa***

Their main concern is that they are not ready to move where ESRI is pushing them. They are also concerned with the lag time and risk in moving to SDE. They don't want to wait any longer for connection speeds and staffing to get set up. They are also concerned about security measures and the need to create their own tables if AIMS were the repository. Don't want to rely on AIMS if a problem arises and Jerry is gone. Speed and multi-user editing are not issues. Their preference would be to get the data from AIMS with the ability to update, add tables and receive support.

***Shawnee***

They do not maintain data in a coverage format, everything is personal geodatabase and shapefiles. There are no plans for SDE at this time.

***Olathe***

They use SDE to feed their IMS sites but do not use geodatabases. They edit SDE layers but don't version them. Would like applications for lightweight end users in the form of myAIMS. Historically, connectivity interruptions and communication issues have prompted them to use the replication process.

***Water One***

They maintain their data in SDE even though they receive coverages and shapefiles from AIMS. They download (pull) data from AIMS manually. Replication option from SQL server is an option.

***Gardner***

They are extremely interested in online mapping services (i.e., myAIMS). They receive data by CD currently. They use ArcView 3.x with coverages and shapefiles although migrating to Arc8. Counting on AIMS to provide the data.