

**Enterprise GIS Steering Committee (EGIS)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
January 6, 2011

**I. Call to Order**

The EGIS Steering Committee meeting was called to order at 1:32 pm on 1/6/2011 in the BTS Conference Room 330, Clearwater Annex building 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor.

**II. Attendance**

Property Appraiser – Pam Dubov, Charlie Dye  
Sheriff's Office – Jim Main, Kristin Preston  
Public Works and Planning – Pete Yauch, David Walker  
Utilities – Kevin Becotte  
BTS – David James

Planning Council – Michael Schoderbock – Guest

**III. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting**

The minutes from the November 4, 2010 meeting were approved by Pete Yauch, seconded by Kevin Becotte, with all in favor.

**IV. Aerial Imagery – Update**

Charlie provided an update on this initiative. SWFWMD will provide the ortho images and Pictometry will provide the oblique images. Both types of images have been taken and are ready to be processed. The Project Manager for Pictometry contacted Charlie to make him aware there are some areas requiring reflight. Pictometry is estimating delivery of all oblique images by mid-January. Ortho images will take longer, promised by mid-February. Pam noted oblique imagery was pushed through with more importance than ortho imagery because the Property Appraiser needs them for the 2011 tax roll. Older aerials can be used but new oblique images were needed. Pictometry has a concern users will take these images for commercial use and has sent David an agreement addressing this concern. (Pictometry has agreements with their other customers stating the images are for non-commercial use only.) They've also sent David an agreement pertaining to use of these images by municipalities. Dennis Long is working with David to review these agreements to make sure the verbiage limits exposure to the County and addresses our Public Records requirements. Pam will touch base with Dennis for status on his review of these agreements. Pictometry will not deliver the images until they have these new agreements.

**V. ESRI Community Map Initiative – Update**

David summarized the proposal and the agreement, which are currently being reviewed by Dennis Long, County Attorney's Office. Dennis has a concern with some of the verbiage in the agreement. Dennis may contact Orange County to find out how they addressed the public records concern. David stated this is not on a critical path; the offer from ESRI is without expiration.

**VI. Strategic Plan – Update**

David provided this update by reviewing a document he posted on the SharePoint site. The Interview Panel (David James, Charlie Dye, and Jason Malpass) started interviewing in October with a very ambitious interview schedule; unfortunately, the pace of the interviews slowed and not all have been completed. Thus far, the Sheriff, Emergency Management, Public Safety Services, and Planning have been completed (note: further meetings with Planning are to be scheduled in the near future). These meetings have allowed the Panel to discover each department's main concerns and their current situations. In most departments, staff reductions have had a major impact, resulting in the inability to maintain current data. Sally Bishop, Jackie Weinrich, and Dick Williams have

# **Enterprise GIS Steering Committee (EGIS)**

## **Meeting Minutes**

January 6, 2011

all expressed their concerns of outdated data used for emergency situations. Public Works relies heavily on GIS data; yet, that data has not been updated in quite some time. Staff is not available to support major initiatives, either in the works (2010 Census) or upcoming (light rail). The Supervisor of Elections (SOE) has redistricting concerns, as a result of the census changes. Pam added the fact that redistricting will be statewide, affecting everyone. Since the SOE cannot afford permanent GIS staff, situations like these are when a Bureau would be beneficial.

David continued to the next topic of the document: data editing and analysis tools are difficult to use. Kevin asked if there is a schedule for migrating the County to ESRI platform. David replied there is no schedule at this time. The plan is to migrate AutoDesk MapGuide web GIS platform to ESRI Arc GIS Server first because it can be done seamlessly, affecting only a small group of people, and will be easier to maintain and use. All data will be stored in Oracle and everybody can view and edit no matter what tool is used. Kevin then asked why the entire County will not be migrated. Pam's response reminded the committee of one of its goal: to determine if it would be best for the entire County to be on one platform or to remain on multiple platforms. Going to one platform has yet to be a request stated in the interviews that have already been completed. Once all interviews are completed, results will be compiled and brought before this committee. The committee will then reach a consensus on how to move forward; but, will have to gain approval from the BTS Board, and ultimately, the County Commission. The Commission continues to question why we are paying for two GIS systems. The next time they ask, we will hopefully have a better answer, one backed by information gathered during these interviews. If the end result is to have all GIS data in Oracle, we would, in essence, be operating on one platform with easy access by departments using the tools they are familiar with. David is in discussions with ESRI to find out what is involved in converting MapGuide (on BCC's website) from AutoDesk to ESRI Arc GIS Server. David displayed the website on the overhead and stated Sally Bishop uses this site to relay information to citizens during evacuations, etc. Pam mentioned her office used to have their own site, similar to MapGuide; but, keeping the information in sync became too much of a hardship. She would sync it again if it was simpler. Pete mentioned, and Kevin confirmed, evacuation zones are also on water bills.

David began summarizing the proposed Short Term Action Plan, the next topic of the document. David is suggesting a workshop be scheduled to discuss several initiatives and ideas:

1. The possibility and potential benefits of forming a GIS Bureau. Initially, this GIS Bureau would be a pilot, which funding would need to be identified and secured.
2. The identification and prioritization of our Enterprise GIS Datasets (see document for a short list of proposed datasets). Some datasets would not be considered enterprise if only utilized by a single department.
3. The suggestion to adopt ESRI tool for all data and define data standards, which don't need to be reinvented because there are many already out there.
4. The benefits of defining data standards and QA processes.
5. The suggestion to replace the current MapGuide GIS with ESRI ArcGis Server web GIS platform.

David Walker inquired if this workshop will be just for this committee or for all departments with GIS needs. Pam suggests scheduling the workshop at a time when Bob LaSala, Mark Woodard, and John Woodruff can attend, since funding for these initiatives would need to be discussed. Pam stated her department cannot take on all this work as part of her budget but she does have staff available to dedicate time to the bureau. She also thinks the adoption of the ESRI platform as a Bureau standard is a good idea because her staff already knows how to use it. Pam then commented 10 datasets is probably a bit much to expect results by August 2011. Pete asked David for clarity on exactly what funding would be needed for the Bureau. David responded that software and hardware are not an issue; funding would be needed for personnel. As for datasets, Kevin is wondering if we would start from scratch or use the ones we currently utilize. David answered that it depends on what would and would not be considered useful. Addressing datasets would be valuable and only require some modifications;

**Enterprise GIS Steering Committee (EGIS)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
January 6, 2011

whereas, the land use datasets would be a judgment call by the Bureau. Charlie commented on the QA processes. They are very important; but, they are currently not thorough and need to be more stringent.

Pam suggested thinking about which projects might be considered an immediate benefit, such as mapping all emergency locations for Sally Bishop. Pam recalls Pete discussing zoning maps during a BCC meeting and the Commission asking if the data will be kept current; unfortunately, budget and staffing issues keep this from happening. In order to move forward with this, we need to hold this workshop; decide on 4, 6, or 10 datasets; get advocates; prioritize implementation plan; and, put it in front of OMB and the Commission for their input and to request funding. Pete suggested incorporating the municipalities' use of our data. The City of Clearwater views our data currently and Safety Harbor and Tarpon Springs have expressed their interest. The Planning Council has the ESRI platform and an Interlocal agreement with 23 municipalities, along with a partnership with PA.

Charlie suggested rather than looking at 10 different datasets countywide, we work on a smaller area – Palm Harbor, for instance. We should look at the datasets needed for that smaller area, define the effort and cost required, and present the findings at the workshop as an example. Charlie estimated it would take about a month to pull together the Palm Harbor stats. Pam asked if looking at a smaller, older area, such as Lealman, might be a better presentation. Charlie provided more detail about Palm Harbor. It was originally the Town of Sutherland and is actually old with a lot of history. Ozona is included, providing coastal area. Kevin agreed and suggested defining specific boundaries within Palm Harbor instead of including the entire town. If specific boundaries are defined, Pam would still like to include the coastal area.

David agreed with everything said and made a suggestion of how to proceed. He will work with Charlie, consulting others as needed, to develop a schedule and related tasks for the pilot, determine resources needed, assign tasks to each resource, draft a plan of implementation, and provide an estimate of necessary funding. They will also contact ESRI to discuss the software needed, define deliverables, set boundaries of the Palm Harbor area to assess, and report findings during the workshop. Pam expressed her concern about how much time this effort may take, which could delay the workshop and possibly end up intermingling with budget meetings. Pam suggested scheduling a preliminary workshop, held before development of the pilot and before funding is estimated. Kevin agreed. We could at least communicate the current status and potential impacts of our lack of GIS resources. The Property Appraiser is still maintaining their data but updates are not done as quickly now. Annexation is maintained for taxing purposes; but, not necessarily for fire service or emergency response purposes. Kevin asked if we have any instances where two entities are maintaining similar, but not identical, data. The pilot would expose these types of situations, and determine what is really necessary.

David asked for a motion to move forward with scheduling a workshop, to include the Committee and other constituents, no later than early February. At that point in time, it's possible we may have a cost schedule and resources defined, for consideration. Kevin suggested acquiring external resources in order to lay the groundwork and then assuming maintenance from that point forward. David reminded the Committee to be cautious and mindful of Purchasing policies; but, thinks ESRI would be a good consultant to assist with best practices, standards, suggestions, etc. Pam would also like to include Dennis [Long] prior to consulting with ESRI, and suggests inviting him to the workshop; so, he is aware of discussions and plans. Charlie agreed with Kevin's idea of incorporating external resources during the initial process, especially with our lack of staff. The Pilot and metrics should give us a better idea the direction we should go. David repeated his request for a motion to move forward with the workshop. David's motion was approved unanimously.

**VII. Open Discussion**

James Dates retired December 31<sup>st</sup>; a new County Administration representative for the committee is needed. Bob LaSala would be the one to make this decision. David will send Bob an email to find out what his decision is.

David made committee members aware all documents and status updates are available on the SharePoint site.

**Enterprise GIS Steering Committee (EGIS)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
January 6, 2011

David brought to the Committee's attention the Health and Human Services Coordinating Council for Pinellas County. The Council collects demographic data around the county. They are building a new website, [pinellasindicators.org](http://pinellasindicators.org), which has a GIS tool called Instant Atlas to view this demographic data. An example would be crime tracked in each of the County's zip codes. The data is in spreadsheet form, in which Instant Atlas then creates a map from the spreadsheet. David gave a quick demo on household income stats, which displayed a table and interactive map. Click on any area of the map and the table updates to display specific data for that area. The Council bought an additional copy of the software and gave it to the County. BTS is hosting it; if anyone wants to utilize it, send data in spreadsheet form to BTS and their WebAdmin group will work with you to publish it. David Walker mentioned a partnership between his department and the Juvenile Welfare Board (JWB) where data was available on the County's website with their stats, including 2-1-1 data.

David found an article in ESRI's ArcNews publication he thought was worth mentioning to the Committee. The article is about the creation and benefits of an enterprise GIS framework. Becky will scan the article and publish it on SharePoint site.

Pam would like to get on the next BTS Board meeting agenda, which will be January 20<sup>th</sup>. She feels it is important to update the Board on the status of this Committee's initiatives and goals, as well as the current situation of our GIS world. They need to be aware of the how much more it will cost the County the further we are behind in maintaining our GIS data.

Pam also wanted to make the Committee aware of upcoming changes in her department. Currently, the Property Appraiser's Office maintains maps in two separate systems. They will soon maintain in only one system. This means the number of staff she currently has for mapping may be reduced; so, moving our initiatives along quickly is of utmost importance to her.

**VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:49pm.

Minutes taken and submitted by Becky Reed.

**Enterprise GIS Steering Committee (EGIS)  
Meeting Minutes  
January 6, 2011**

**Action Items from September, 2010 meeting**

<b>Action Item Number</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>
20100902-E	Inventory department's mapping needs and GIS staff	All members
20100902-I	Contact City Managers group to determine if there is interest in participating in upcoming workshop	David James

**Action Items from November, 2010 meeting**

<b>Action Item Number</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>
20101104-A	Schedule technical workshop for installing image viewing software	David James/Charlie Dye
20101104-B	Contact Lee County for Pictometry's new imagery turnaround time after natural disaster	Charlie Dye

**Action Items from January, 2011 meeting**

<b>Action Item Number</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>
20110106-A	Review Pictometry agreements (with Dennis Long, County Attorney's Office)	David James/Pam Dubov
20110106-B	Develop schedule and related action items for Pilot	David James/Charlie Dye
20110106-C	Schedule awareness workshop to include Committee, appropriate GIS-related department staff, OMB, and Commission	David James
20110106-D	Contact Bob LaSala for Asst. County Administrator replacement of James Dates on Committee	David James
20110106-E	Scan and post to Sharepoint ArcNews article	Becky Reed
20110106-F	Request placement of EGIS Committee on BTS Board Agenda	Pam Dubov