

**KC Metro GIS**  
**November 17, 2006**  
**Meeting notes**

**Attendees:**

Craig Arnold, Cass County  
Bradley McCloud, MoDOT  
Pete Decker, MoDOT  
Kathy Robertson, Independence  
Keith Shaw, Lee's Summit  
Jay Heermann, Johnson County AIMS  
Steve Marsh, Jackson County  
Jim LaScala, City of Liberty  
Heather Eisenbarth, City of Raymore  
Craig Best, Census Bureau  
Ingrid Landgraf, USGS  
Michael Peterman, City of Blue Springs  
Lynn Gant, City of KCMO

Joe Eckmann, ESRI  
Dawn Hilderbrand, City of KCMO  
Huaguo Xiao, Clay County  
Barbara Taylor, Census Bureau  
Darin Welch, HNTB

**MARC staff:**

Brian Parr  
Frank Lenk  
Andrea Repinsky  
Phil Castro  
Destiny Richardson  
Jake Goldman

1. Introductions
2. Regional project update
  - a. 2006 Aerials
    - i. Brian Parr distributed an updated project schedule. The final Cass, Johnson, and Leavenworth images have been delivered, and Wyandotte and Clay will be completed soon.
    - ii. Steve Marsh is having tone balancing issues resolved by GE.
    - iii. USGS found QC issues, including pixel shifts, that the county-level QC did not find. Ingrid Landgraf distributed 2 photos as examples. Landgraf requested extra diligence from the counties as they perform their QC.
    - iv. Parr asked for reports on how loading and storage is going—Johnson County converts the images to SID format. Jackson County will load into SDE and create SIDs. Some small cities have reported problems with storing and using the large files.
    - v. Cities with payments outstanding were listed by Parr.
    - vi. Parr plans to start the planning process for the next aerial capture in 2008 at the next KC MetroGIS meeting. A subcommittee may be formed. Cass, Jackson, KCMO, Clay are among the areas desiring a 2-year schedule. USGS matching funding will be more likely if the purchase plans are finalized by September 2007.
  - b. Homeland Security Regional Data Server
    - i. Project overview: GISe is an IMS application integrated with the regional WebEOC, which is an online information posting board for use by emergency responders during an emergency event. In the short term, we will load basic data such as boundaries, and critical facilities including hospitals, nursing homes, and trailer parks. The server is housed in Overland Park.
    - ii. Next, several questions will be answered, such as:

1. What is the final data list?
2. How will data be obtained, collected, and shared, and maintained?
3. How will data be backed up?
- iii. Parr addressed system questions:
  1. Why are there 2 servers? WebEOC and IMS need to be on separate servers.
  2. Can the application be customized?
  3. Who has access? The policy is being determined.
- iv. Next steps include installation with the default configuration, testing, and obtaining SDE. Later, the master data list, data maintenance plans, and data sharing agreements will be finalized. In the long term, the planning process will be revisited to address changes in needs and requirements.
- v. Shaw clarified that data will not be distributed outside of the project for now, in order to obtain data access, though the Department of Homeland Security favors wider data distribution.

### 3. Regional GPS Base Stations

- a. Betty Sheil, KCMO's Surveyor, promoted the idea of developing permanent GPS base stations with cell phone connection capability. Why: mobile equipment is expensive, and must be monitored while in the field. One mobile setup costs about \$50,000 per year. Permanent base stations would save much of this expense. Sheil proposed establishing 6-7 permanent base stations, based on a 20-mile station service radius. Cell phone connectivity allows greater range than mobile equipment, and data communication via internet. Each base station would cost \$15,000-25,000, plus other costs which need to be determined. Departments of transportation are using this system in Texas, Michigan, Ohio, Washington. Jim LaScala suggests a joint purchasing project, similar to the aeriels. Beneficiaries would include public works & engineering firms, public & private parties. Sheil would like the system to be free to the public. LaScala suggests checking on state data standards. Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources are ready to assist, and MoDOT may participate as part of a statewide effort. Questions arose regarding how to proceed, since private firms are interested in establishing base stations, sometimes offering paid subscriptions for the data.

### 4. Census 2010 Local Update of Census Addresses Program

- a. Craig Best of the U.S. Census Bureau described LUCA: a voluntary program for local governments to review the Census address list and submit corrections. The address list is confidential, however, and cannot be used or kept locally.
- b. Best described the three options for participation:
  - i. Census provides addresses and maps, hard copy (if small city) or digital, and collection (temporary) block boundaries. Addresses can be flagged by the locals to be added, deleted, or moved.
  - ii. The local government can submit their local addresses, and Census performs the field review.
  - iii. Local government receives maps, but no address list and stats per block.
- c. The Census will give feedback to the local governments regarding which local edits were kept. Census will give low-accuracy address points back to the local governments.

- d. Why do local governments want to participate? The Census count will be more accurate. Updates missed for the end of the decade will be partially caught by the USPS. Lenk asked if the review effort should be coordinated regionally in some way, in order to guarantee the most accurate Census possible. Marsh voiced support for the idea, and wondered if the Census could mention any regional coordination effort in the solicitation letters. The letter is done, but MARC or the counties could send another letter offering services or coordination.
- e. Scheduling: Promotional workshops will be held in winter-spring 2007. Letters will be sent to local governments to solicit participation, along with registration forms, in July 2007. Late summer 2007 to 2008 = the review period. Nov 2008-2009 = field review. Late 2009 = review results will be distributed, followed by a review and appeal period.

Next meeting: February 16, 2007