

## Coordinators Meeting Minutes

January, 16 2003

Johnson County Administration Building

March 20, 2003

### Agenda:

#### Business Meeting Topics

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 9:00 – 9:10 | Introductions/Announcements  |
| 9:10 – 9:20 | ArcGIS 8.3 Status  |
|             | Compatibility issues related with SQL Service pack 3 and arcsde 8.3  |
|             | ArcGIS 8.3 release – what to expect?   |
|             | ArcIMS 4.0.1   |
| 9:20 – 9:30 | Status of DFIRM  |
| 9:30 – 9:50 | Centerline/Address Issues follow up – This is a follow up to the AIMS Coordinators Meeting that was held in January. Please see meeting notes on the web to get familiar with the topics that were discussed:<br><a href="http://aims.jocoks.com/coordmtg.htm">http://aims.jocoks.com/coordmtg.htm</a> |

#### Presentation/Demonstration

- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| 10:00 – 10:15 | Fishboning within ArcMap  |
| 10:15 – 10:30 | GPS capabilities in AddVantage (Address Verification application) |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Arc 8 Desktop Enhancements  |
|               | Normal.mxt customization deployment                               |
|               | Use of label expressions  |

### Announcements:

1. Introduction to ArcGIS 8 Class announcement will be held in Olathe on April 14 and 15<sup>th</sup>. Cost is \$350 a day.
2. ArcNews recent publication had information on a free VBA tutorial cd. This can be received by contacting ESRI. It covers the basics of using VBA in ArcMap.
3. Tony Perkins from Lenexa talked highly of his recent attendance at a Migrating Coverages to Geodatabase Seminar put on by ESRI.
4. Planimetric Update. MJ Harden has been chosen as the vendor for the 2003 planimetric project. The county has been flown and a project kick off meeting has been scheduled with AIMS.
5. Co\_plats coverage change. AIMS is proposing to remove the yearplatted field from the coverage and it will be replaced with the yearrecorded field which is a redefined field from the daterecorded field. There were no objections from the group on this change.

### **ArcGIS 8.3 Status – Amber Shultz**

#### ArcGIS

1. Topology: 25 rules included with 8.3. More rules to be shipped in future releases. Users can define topology rules between and within feature classes. Any errors found can be fixed or marked as exceptions. Exceptions will remain consistent throughout dataset life.
2. Advanced editing capabilities:
  - a. New tools for land records management include traverse, fillet, inverse, and proportion.
  - b. A snap indicator.
  - c. New line trim tool that trims lines that cross lines
  - d. New annotation tools allow for the ability to scale, rotate, edit annotation & curve around anchor point or shape.
3. Disconnected editing
  - a. New single use license for ArcEditor in addition to floating license
  - b. ArcPad integration
4. Complete linear referencing (create/edit/visualize/analyze routes and events) - Equivalent of dynamic segmentation that has been in workstation ArcInfo
5. Introduces 3 new extensions: Survey Analyst, ArcScan for raster to vector conversion, and Tracking Analyst to track temporal data.
6. Visual Studio .NET support for ArcObjects. C# and VB.NET examples included on CD.

#### ArcView 8.3 Highlights

1. Symbolology and editing tools expanded

2. More use of wizards
3. Metadata management
4. Single user disconnected editing for ArcPad
5. Tablet support
6. ArcIMS connection support

### SDE 8.3

1. Support for Oracle 9i release 2
2. Updates for MO 2.2, CAD client, C API, Java API
3. There is a problem w/ SQL Server 2000 Service Pack 3 (SP3). SP3 fixes vulnerabilities to slamer worm. Symptoms include long response times from ArcMap or ArcCatalog. The issue is caused by delete statements issued during connection/disconnection to SDE. At this time, ESRI recommends not installing SP3. Instead, users should install SP2 with security patches (MS02-039, MS02-043, MS02-056, or MS02-061).

If SP3 is already installed, Database Administrators can manually truncate SDE log files for connected users; additionally, some prolonged delete processes may need to be killed.

See ESRI Knowledge Base for more information.

### ArcIMS 4.0.1

1. New installation. Cannot have 4.0 and 4.0.1 running on same machine.
2. New ArcMap Server – fixes 4.0 memory leaks. ArcMap Server still requires a key code, which is free.
3. Requires SDE 8.3 to run the Metadata Server.
4. Metadata Server now comes w/ Z39.50 connector, so entities can connect to the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).
5. New MetadataExplorer example
6. Tools for exporting and importing metadata
7. New Java connector example
8. Installation streamlined for common server configurations!

## **DFIRM Status – Ryan Boyce**

AIMS recently pulled the DFIRM coverage from the IMS and is evaluating the accuracy and currency of the dataset before it is put back out on the web. There have been a lot of inquiries on the dataset from the public. Ryan has been working with Kent Lage and David Peel to try and evaluate the 3 coverages that AIMS has and to decide what coverage has the best currency and accuracy.

## **Centerline/Addressing Issues follow up – Matt Wennstedt**

This is a follow up to the discussions held during the January AIMS Meeting with regards to Centerline and Addressing Issues. Below is a copy of the documentation that was handed out at the meeting with the addition of what was discussed during the meeting in **Red**.

*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.

- Streets need to be added when they become navigable.
- Notification of grading permit from the cities.
- Working with engineering firms and cities to submit plats at the preliminary plat stage. Routed through ECC.

- We are still trying to figure out the best way to capture the data once the plat has been received. Some options that have been discussed are:

Georeferencing the digital image (would require the move to geodatabase).

Coordination of GPS efforts with AIMS and the Cities.

*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.

- The Lenexa issue has been resolved.
- Still need to work on a county-wide effort – a lot of inconsistency
- See if there is still resistance on assigning 0 ranges for one side of the street, I think OP had some concern.
- No concerns were raised if we decide to go with empty (0) ranges for the entire county.

*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.

- This change will require a lot of manual work and because of this it has been placed on the back burner.
- Not only dealing with placement of nodes but also address range changes.
- It was decided that there would need to be some discussion between AIMS and Doug Johnson and Carol McCoy to find out what their resistance to this change is if there is any.
- There seems to be no concerns for any CAD systems
- Lenexa stressed that they would be better if broken.

*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.

- Meeting has been scheduled with OP to develop a plan of attack to define tasks, assign responsibilities and set a schedule.

*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.

We have worked through a proof of concept on a design for tracking changes using SDE and SQL queries with positive results. No immediate plans for a centerline change IMS.

*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

Change has occurred.

*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.

- The standards are placed on the AIMS website. We understand that these standards don't carry a lot of weight when trying to enforce but we would like to encourage the use of these standards in hopes of a better countywide dataset.

*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.

- We would like to see all preliminary and final plats be submitted to Mark Whelan for review. Mark will be reviewing street names and address assignments and will get back with you in a 24 hour time period. Prefers the plats to be submitted digitally but can be submitted in hard copy format.
- ECC and AIMS have met and discussed the plat submittal process to almost all the major cities. Meetings have been scheduled with Shawnee and Merriam.
- It was mentioned that a few cities are trying to get ordinances passed to follow the addressing standards for specific situations. This is a positive.

*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.

- 100 blocks have been assigned and updated on the web for the entire county with the exception of a few missing roads from Edgerton Rd to county line.
- AIMS has met and discussed this implementation of the 100 block with address assigners from various cities.

*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.

- These are the only areas in the county where we don't have verified addresses.
- Meeting scheduled next Monday with the city of Shawnee in creating an address point file.
- AIMS staff is currently verifying Prairie Village and Mission Hills.

*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.

Ponder/dream about this. No concrete steps for now.

### **Fishboning in ArcMap – Keith Shaw**

Fishboning is used as an address match tool that uses address points and the centerline file. This was created in ArcMap so that Olathe can use it to identify inconsistencies in their address points with the AIMS centerline file. Keith has added the option to write out a text file through the application that tracks the errors in the centerline file. This text file is then given to AIMS and the changes are made to the centerline file. This process has worked out great and AIMS is encouraging others to use this when sending mass updates through

[streetinfo@jocoks.com](mailto:streetinfo@jocoks.com).

This can be used by anyone who uses ArcMap by simply deploying a dll and ini files.

### **GPS in AddVantage – Keith Shaw**

GPS capabilities have been added to the AIMS addressing application (AddVantage). This isn't being used to collect data but rather as a navigation tool when doing address verification in the field. It has the capability to collect data and be used to maintain the centerline file but isn't being used for data collection at this time. Even though AIMS is using a rather cheap GPS receiver, the accuracy has been very good.

### **Arc8 Desktop Enhancements – Shannon Porter**

Shannon discussed the deployment of a modified normal.mxt that AIMS uses. The main advantage is that it allows users to navigate to datasets without knowing exactly where the dataset resides on the server. These datasets are using layer and group layer files that are hitting SDE. Label expressions were shown for easy use of labeling parcel id numbers, addresses etc. The code for the label expressions was given out at the meeting. The last thing Shannon showed was how to create a pdf map book that consists of multiple eps files. The example he showed had 506 eps files combined into one pdf.