

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD

January 8, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.  
Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; and Hon. Victor Ashe, Mayor, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Central Accounting; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. David Reece, Manager, KUB Information Services; Mr. Richard Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Knoxville/Knox County Geographic Information System.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, December 15, 1989, were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe stated that State law required the vote of each member to be listed in the minutes for all votes which were not unanimous. Mayor Ashe made a motion to amend the minutes to list the vote of each member, on the item under the heading **Additional Business, Holiday Change**, and to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### AERIAL PHOTO UPDATES:

John Lutz explained that the GIS was planning to do the first aerial photo updates to the planimetric and topographic maps this spring. The approximate area chosen for the updates is between Lovell Road on the west and Interstate 640 on the east and extending north and south to the county boundary. Current plans are to re-fly this area and get mylar enlargements of the photos. The existing maps will be compared to the new aerial photos to determine the changes needed to update each sheet. The budget to be allocated for the updating of this area, inclusive of photography and digitizing will be approximately \$185,000. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to proceed with the updates, Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### CAPITAL COST ALLOCATION:

John Lutz explained to the Policy Board that he is working on a usage based cost allocation formula for GIS expenses as required by the Tri-Party Agreement. He explained that there is a problem with the usage based allocation of the principal

and interest payments on the bond issue used to fund start-up costs of the GIS. The principal and interest payments, because they are large relative to the operating expenses, might levy a disproportionate charge to certain system users. This type of allocation might: (1) discourage people from using the system or (2) encourage users to find away around paying the charges. Neither of these possibilities are in the best interests of the GIS which is best served when everyone participates. It was pointed out that at the end of this fiscal year \$3,413,421 out of the \$6,826,039 payback on the bonds will have paid in equal shares by the three existing participants. This leaves a balance of \$3,412,618 of principal and interest remaining to be paid.

John Lutz ask for approval from the Board to continue exploring the overall cost allocation issue with the assumption that the dividing of the Principal and Interest payments on the bonds could continue to be divided equally. John stated that equal allocation of the bond payments might require an amendment to the Tri-Party Agreement; he indicated that this aspect will also be investigated. All members agreed that the GIS should continue working with the finance staffs of the three organizations and submit a proposal for dividing the start-up costs and amending the Tri-Party Agreement if needed. John Lutz will report back to the Policy Board when this is accomplished.

#### ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Mayor Ashe asked if all GIS money was being kept in separate accounts for the purpose of allocating interest to the three entities. Kathy Hamilton explained that the money is kept as a whole for the purpose of investment but that the bookkeeping is there to figure the interest. The Policy Board wanted to know the rate of interest being drawn on these accounts and Mrs. Hamilton agreed to prepare a report for the next Policy Board meeting.

David Reece asked when the interest accrued on the bond proceeds would be divided among the three entities. Mr. Kessel mentioned that a motion was made at the last meeting to divide the interest as soon as government regulations were finalized. Kathy Hamilton stated that the Government Finance Association said it would be a couple more months before the regulations were finalized.

#### ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETING: March 12, 1990; 8:30 a.m., Room 549 City/County Building.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD

March 12, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; and Hon. Victor Ashe, Mayor, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Central Accounting; Mr. Richard Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB, Information Services; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Knoxville/Knox County Geographic Information System.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, January 8, 1990, were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the minutes and Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### AMENDMENT TO TRI-PARTY AGREEMENT

Mr. Hoskins explained that the need to split the principal and interest on the bonds three ways would require two amendments to the Tri-Party Agreement. John Lutz explained that the original Tri-Party Agreement gives the Policy Board the right to amend the agreement by majority vote. Mr. Hoskins then asked if there was any discussion on the amendments. At this time Mr. Kessel stated that he would like to include an additional item (G) to the proposed amendments for section "9. Operating Costs". The proposed change is to allow equipment amortization to be included in the operating costs. A brief discussion of the merits of this addition followed. The Chairman called for a motion to add item "G":

G. Equipment Amortization (as determined by the Policy Board).

to the proposed amendment for section "9". Mr. Kessel made the motion and it was seconded by Mayor Ashe. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

The Chairman then asked for a motion to approve the two amendments, as amended to the Tri-Party Agreement. Mr. Kessel made a motion to amend the Tri-Party Agreement replacing the

existing section "7. B." with the revised section proposed in the agenda materials and replacing the current section "9." with the proposed section "9." as amended in the prior vote. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- A. John Lutz reported on the Knoxville/Knox County addressing committee recently convened by MPC. The committee, made up of representatives from the City, County, KUB, MPC, E911, and the Postal Service, has as its goals: rectifying existing problems with street naming and addressing; developing standards and policies for addressing; and establishing legal authority for comprehensive Knoxville/Knox County addressing. Mr. Lutz expressed his hopes that this effort would result in a better addressing and street naming system for the entire community.
- B. Mr. Lutz reported that the first rebate of interest from the bond issue earnings has been made to each of the participants. The remainder of the interest earnings will be rebated pending completion of the excess interest calculation.
- C. The Director gave a brief update to the Policy Board on the current status of the GIS. Mr. Lutz indicated that no progress has been made in loading the non-graphic attribute database due to loss of map editing support from some of the user departments and the increased support demanded by the users. Mr. Lutz stated that the aerial photography contractor is ready and waiting for two clear days to fly the aerial photography. Mr. Lutz stated that the downtown area and the area around Eastbridge Industrial Park were added to the areas to be photographed this spring. Mr. Lutz indicated that the second issue of the GIST newsletter had been published in early January. The members of the Policy Board acknowledged receipt of the newsletter and recommended additional community members to be included on the mailing list for the newsletter.

#### ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

The Chairman asked Kathy Hamilton (Director of Knox County Central Accounting) if she would make a report to the Policy Board regarding the interest earnings accrued to the equipment replacement and aerial photography reserve funds. Ms. Hamilton stated that she required some direction from the Policy Board as to the particular method to be used for calculating the accrued interest. Ms. Hamilton asked the Policy Board members if an interest calculation based on an



average monthly interest rate would be sufficient or if the actual daily rates should be obtained from the banks to make the calculation. The Policy Board Members instructed her to use the averaging method so she could obtain her results more quickly. Ms. Hamilton then asked whether or not the accrued interest was to remain in the fund to compound or if it was to be rebated to the participants. The Policy Board decided to let the earnings remain in the accounts to compound.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, May 14, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.

**MINUTES**  
**POLICY BOARD MEETING**

May 14, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.  
Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; and Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering (representing Mayor Ashe).

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. David Reece, Manager, KUB Information Services; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Central Accounting; Mr. Jim York, Deputy Finance Director, City of Knoxville; and John Lutz, GIS, Director.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, March 12, 1990, were brought to the floor for approval. David Reece asked for clarification concerning the calculations used to determine the accrued interest on the reserve funds. He stated that on March 12, the Policy Board approved a proposal to use average monthly interest rates to calculate the interest on the reserve funds. David asked if the average monthly rates would be used to determine the interest in the future. John Lutz explained that henceforth the money would be invested separately and the interest would accrue per the actual returns on the investments. David Reece then inquired about a statement made in the previous Policy Board Meeting pertaining to the loss of support from MPC in the editing process as being part of the reason for the delay in loading the database. Mr. Lutz explained that MPC had discontinued editing support to begin work on zoning maps and to concentrate on improving addressing information. There was discussion about the importance of the role that MPC plays in the GIS and the need for their attendance at the Policy Board Meetings.

Mr. Kessel then asked for a description of the process for updating maps when changes occur. Mr. Lutz explained the process and there was discussion as to how soon the GIS users would be aware of any changes made to maps.

Mr. Lutz informed everyone of the plans to work with City Building Inspection to interface their building permit tracking system with the GIS system. This interface will allow users of the GIS to be aware of outstanding building permits.

Mr. Kessel asked if condominiums presented a problem to the GIS. Mr. Lutz discussed some of the problems with condos and stated that solutions had to be worked out to handle them almost on a case by case basis.

Mr. Lutz informed the Policy Board of the Comprehensive Addressing Committee which MPC has formed to establish better policies and procedures for addressing. There was some discussion about the problems with addressing and the goals that the Comprehensive Addressing Committee plans to accomplish.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the minutes and Sam Parnell seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### FISCAL YEAR 1990 PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr. Lutz summarized the proposed '90 budget and compared each of the line items (copy attached) to the current year's budget:

The Salary line item increased as a result of the plans to add a new employee to assist the System Manager.

Travel and Training expenses decreased from last years budgeted amount, but are up from the actual expenditures because scheduling difficulties prevented completion of all the planned training courses.

Operating expenses are up due to an increase in the amount of plotter supplies needed to produce maps.

Mr. Lutz explained that the Contract Services line item, included the cost of a computer operator which Automated Systems provides to attend the plotter and perform tape backups in the evenings and on weekends.

The Equipment line item includes the cost for office equipment and furniture needed for the new GIS offices. Kathy Hamilton, Central Accounting, suggested that the new equipment be purchased with the remaining bond fund since that money needs to be spent to prevent the earning of excess interest. The current balance of the bond fund is \$196,174.00 and \$180,000.00 has been obligated for planimetric updates. This would leave a balance of approximately \$16,000. Mr. Lutz made a proposal that the new equipment be purchased from this remaining balance and the amount allocated in the budget be removed.

Mr. Lutz explained that the Equipment Reserve line item is in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement where it was agreed to set aside 12% of the total equipment value each year for

equipment replacement. This line item increased slightly due to the purchase of additional equipment this year. John Lutz explained that if equipment is sold or retired during the upcoming year this cost will go down.

The Aerial Photography Reserve fund will remain at \$70,000.00.

Maintenance costs are up from last year due to additional equipment and an increase in the monthly charge for on-site maintenance.

The total budget including principal and interest payments is 1,774,803.00. This amount is up 2.7% over the estimated expenditures for the current year and 2% over what was budgeted last year. Mr. Kessel asked about the balance of the principal and interest payments and Mr. Lutz stated there were 5 years of payments remaining.

#### OUTSIDE REVENUES

Since the beginning of the year \$41,806.16 has been credited toward the budget from outside sales. There is approximately \$12,000.00 which is yet to be credited, which would bring the total to \$53,806.00 or 8.5% of the budgeted operating expenses.

John Lutz informed the Policy Board that this amount could change because there is some talk underway with the First Utility District, Concord Telephone, and the City of Farragut about becoming participants in the GIS system. Mr. Lutz stated that he would keep the Policy Board informed of these matters.

Mr. Kessel stated that if a proposal is made to these utilities it must be one that can be made available to any utility. Mr. Lutz explained that the GIS is working on a formula that could be applied to everyone.

Mr. Lutz further explained that potential users would be divided into several different categories. One category would be the participant category which would be like First Utility. They would participate in the GIS as do KUB, the City and County and have a different cost formula than someone who would be a subscriber. A subscriber might be an individual, a company such as an engineering firm that would periodically connect to the system to get information. They would purchase an annual license and their costs would be based only on usage. All users would buy and maintain their own equipment and pay the costs for using the system.

There was discussion about allowing these participants to serve on the Board. Mr. Kessel stated that to serve on the Policy Board the initial costs would have to be amortized and paid by the interested participant. Mr. Kessel further



stated that these participants could sit with the Board in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Lutz then asked if anyone had any questions concerning the budget. Jim York asked if the 4.5% set aside for Cost of Living Adjustments would be fixed if the budget was adopted today. Mr. Kessel explained that this was a budget figure that it would have to come back to the Policy Board for approval of the final rate.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the budget and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### STATUS UPDATE

The last two remaining property map sheets have been accepted from Baker bringing the conversion officially to a close.

The photography for this year's updates is complete and has been delivered. Over the next several months several UT students will be working with us to review the photos and select map sheets for update.

The spring newsletter has been printed and mailed to approximately 150 people.

#### THE COMING YEAR

Mr. Lutz stated that the goals for next year will be: to reduce funding levels required from the City, County, and KUB by increasing revenues from outside sales; work with Gas, Water, and Wastewater to get conversion underway; complete automation of subdivision review to recorded plat work flow including addressing; work with MPC to automate zoning maps; and evaluate methods for less expensive update of maps from aerial photography.

There was some discussion about how current the GIS maps would be. In addition someone asked if MPC was aware of the meetings. Mr. Lutz stated that they were sent an agenda.

Kathy Hamilton gave a brief update on the interest figures for the reserve funds. The interest on the aerial photography fund for this year through March is approximately \$9,300.00 and the interest on the equipment reserve through March is approximately \$11,200.00. This would bring the balance of the aerial photography fund to approximately \$178,000 and the equipment reserve to \$193,000.00.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, July 9, 1990 at 8:30 a.m., City/County Building, Room 549.

Approved.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

July 16, 1990 at 2:00 p.m.  
Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; and Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. David Reece, Manager, KUB Information Services; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Central Accounting; Mr. Jim York, Deputy Finance Director, Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB, Information Services; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. Jim Moore, Director, Administrative Services, Metropolitan Planning Commission; and Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information Systems.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, May 14, 1990, were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### COLA RAISES

John Lutz, GIS Director, stated that a 4.5% increase had been allocated for cost of living adjustments but he explained that this amount was for budget purposes only. Mr. Lutz recommended a 4% increase based on what the City, County, and the Utilities Board had received. This raise will be effective July 1, 1990. Mayor Ashe made the motion to accept this recommendation and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

#### INDIRECT SPACE CHARGES

Mr. Lutz explained that under the Tri-Party Agreement charges for office space were to be paid by the GIS participants. Mr. Lutz stated that the Public Building Authority (PBA) only recognizes City and County tenants and at this time the GIS Department is occupying County space. Kathy Hamilton explained that at this time

the Policy Board will only be considering the office space and not the space in the Computer Room because there is some question as to whose space the GIS is occupying in that particular room. The rent for the computer room will be considered at a later date. At this time the office space occupied is 1177.3 square feet. PBA charges \$9.39 per square foot making the annual rent \$11,055.00 which is now paid by the County. Kathy Hamilton also mentioned that Central Accounting is trying to determine how much of the cost of the annual audit is payable by the GIS Department. These figures are not available at this time but will be available for next year's budget.

Mayor Ashe then asked if the \$11,055.00 would be taken out of this year's budget and if it had been allocated. John Lutz stated that this amount had not been allocated in this year's budget but that it might be possible to pay it from the remaining balance in the '90 budget. Kathy Hamilton then stated that the year had not been closed out yet, but the way third quarter billings were done might make it possible to take this payment from FY '89-'90 funds.

Mayor Ashe made a motion to pay this amount for office space and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

#### **STATUS:**

Mr. Lutz summarized the results of the work that had been done comparing the newly acquired aerial photography with the existing planimetric maps which were based on 1985 aerial photography. Currently 462 out of 568 total maps have been received and 245 or 53% of the sheets will require some changes.

Property maps have all been combined into a single directory so that queries based on address can now search all parcels in the county. Mr. Lutz stated that there were some addresses which had been tried but were not found in the parcel database. Mr. Kessel asked what problem resulted in a particular address not being found. Did it result from the street spelling, the street type or what? Mr. Lutz stated that a significant part of the problem was a result of the software not updating index files properly. Mr. Hoskins asked if the software was being corrected. Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS was working with Intergraph on this problem, but Intergraph's priorities were development of the newer software and their cooperation on fixing the old software has been less than desirable. Mr. Lutz said that the GIS was continuing to work with Intergraph regarding these software problems. Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Kessel both expressed the need for the GIS to stay "on top" of this problem because of its importance.

Mr. Lutz stated that MPC is working to digitize subdivisions as they come in for subdivision review. He stated that subdivision updates may be a little behind and he stressed the importance of having up-to-date property information. He stated that everyone

would be working to bring these up-to-date. David Reece then asked how much time it takes from the time of concept plan submittal until the information is available on the system. Jim Moore directed this question to Sue Adams who stated that this process takes a week or less. John Lutz then explained that there is a backlog of subdivisions which occurred while MPC was unable to perform updates on the system. Mr. Kessel asked the status of these backlogs and Sue Adams stated that MPC was almost caught up.

John Lutz then stated that the Technical Committee as well as representatives from the City, County, and KUB have been working on a policy to allow non-participants to use the GIS. For example, utility districts, Lenoir City, and Farragut. John Lutz stated that he hoped to have additional information by the next Policy Board meeting.

Mr. Hoskins asked what philosophy was being used to figure price. John Lutz explained that basically users would be charged some proportion of the database development cost equivalent to the number of map sheets in their district. Then they would pay a licensing fee which would essentially be a 10 year amortization of their start-up cost share. Then they would pay basically the same costs as the City, County, and KUB for usage. Mr. Kessel added that they should also agree to share in the updating costs and process.

John Lutz also updated the Policy Board on the accounting software. The software is still being evaluated to set the rates for various things. John Lutz also mentioned allowing a couple of months to evaluate the bills and discuss with the Policy Board at a later date. Mr. Kessel also mentioned allowing a transition period to allow the users to adjust to the new billing.

John Lutz also mentioned that MPC will be working on their zoning conversion as well as KUB, Gas and Water working on their conversion in the fall.

Mayor Ashe mentioned that he would like to change the date of the next meeting from September 10, 1990 to possibly September 11, 1990. All members will be notified of a change in the date.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, November 12, 1990 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.



## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

September 12, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; and Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Jim Moore, Director, Administrative Services, MPC; Mr. David Reece, Manager, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Beth Bowman, KUB Rates Group; Ms. Sandy Goins, Property Assessor's Office; Ms. Vicki Rush, Property Assessor's Office; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, MPC; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Central Accounting; and Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information Systems.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, July 16, 1990, were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### OPERATING COST CLARIFICATION

John Lutz explained that at a previous Policy Board meeting an amendment to the Tri-Party Agreement had been approved to allow for the inclusion of equipment amortization as an operating cost of the GIS. It has not been clearly defined exactly what can be included as equipment amortization costs. As a part of this amendment a phrase was added to the Tri-Party Agreement stating (. . . as determined by the Policy Board) so that the Policy Board could later determine what cost should be included under the category equipment amortization. Mr. Lutz stated that over the past month he had met with representatives from the City, County, and KUB in an attempt to more closely define these costs.

Mr. Lutz explained the proposed amendments (Attachment 1) to the Tri-Party Agreement were intended to clarify equipment amortization costs. Mr. Lutz then explained the equipment replacement sinking fund, which requires that 12% of the initial cost of hardware in service to be set aside yearly for equipment updates. Mr. Kessel asked what happened when equipment was retired before the 8 year period for complete depreciation. Mr. Lutz explained that when equipment is no longer needed and is taken out of service it is taken off the equipment inventory list and the 12% is no longer paid on this piece of equipment.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the amendments, as presented in Attachment 1, to the Tri-Party Agreement, Mayor Ashe seconded that motion. Mr. Kessel added that in the future amendments should be dated to enable better tracking of the revisions. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

## **LEVEL II PARTICIPANTS**

Mr. Lutz stated the Technical Committee as well as representatives from the City Finance Department, Knox County Central Accounting Office, and KUB have been working on a proposal to define another category of users on the GIS. Mr. Lutz explained that the GIS has been approached by several utility districts interested in the GIS maps or tying into the system. Mr. Lutz explained that he has been unable to give them any information regarding costs up to this point and hopes that this proposal will lay the ground work for negotiations to begin. Mr. Lutz went on to explain the definition of Level II participants and the methodology for determining the costs to this type of user. (see Attachment 2).

Mayor Ashe asked who might meet the requirements for a Level II participant as defined by this proposal. Mr. Lutz stated that the Town of Farragut, Lenoir City Utility Board, South Central Bell, water utility districts, and primarily government agencies would meet the criteria for being a Level II participant.

Mayor Ashe asked if there was an escalation clause in the proposal which would allow for an increase in the cost to the users in the event the operating expenses of the GIS increased. Mr. Lutz stated that there is no escalation clause in the annual license fee but the formula for figuring the participants' costs included some operating expenses as a factor in determining their costs. Therefore, if the operating expenses increase the usage charge to the participants would increase.

Kathy Hamilton added that the participants would be signing a license contract which would lock them into the fee determined by the formula for a period of 3-5 years. At the end of this contract the fee could be inflated if necessary.

Mr. Kessel asked if there was a way to ensure that Level II users would participate in the update of the system as well as input their own information to be used across the system. Mr. Lutz explained that it was discussed during the development of this proposal that a Level II participant who fails to update or add their own information would fall into another user category. This category might be what we are considering as a Contract System User. This type of user would be typified by someone who needs access to the whole county but would not be adding any information to the system. The rate would be higher for this type of user than for a Level II participant.

Mr. Lutz further explained that the users would only have a license to use the information and not to sell it.

Mr. Lutz stated that this proposal would only be used to negotiate with potential Level II participants and that the Policy Board

would review any contracts or additional requirements needed at a later date. Mr. Hoskins stated that it would be a good idea for someone to begin working on writing a license agreement.

Mr. Lutz also informed the Policy Board of the work that has been done in Nashville concerning the Public Information Law. Last year a GIS group in Nashville proposed changing the state law so that systems such as the Knoxville/Knox County GIS would be treated differently under the Public Information Law. John Lutz said that he has suggested that consultants, which Knox County and Nashville have worked with in the past and who are familiar with both counties and the State of Tennessee laws, send a proposal to both counties about drawing up legislation dealing specifically with these types of systems. Mr. Lutz mentioned that the state of Alaska had passed some model legislation on this matter.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to accept this proposal regarding a framework for Level II participants and Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### **STATUS UPDATE**

Mr. Lutz informed the Policy Board that KUB Electric Bureau had finished their successful conversion project in August.

He also stated that the KUB Gas Bureau is in the process of awarding a contract for their conversion project.

Mr. Lutz stated that the prices for the planimetric and topographic update have been received from Michael Baker, Jr. He explained that \$180,000 had been budgeted for aerial photography and updating. This amount should allow for approximately 50% of the needed map sheets to be updated. This means that a decision will have to be made to determine which 50% of the needed map sheets will be updated.

Mr. Hoskins asked how the aerial updating is done. Mr. Lutz explained that a portion of the County is flown, generally in the area which have changed the most. Mr. Kessel asked what the plans for fly over were. Mr. Lutz stated that he hoped to do a section of the county each year.

Mr. Kessel asked how the updating was going on the ground level. He explained that he wanted to know the status of subdivision updates and if everyone is getting enough information currently. John stated that with the new addressing ordinance it would be necessary to post addresses and that it will allow building inspectors to require that the correct address be posted. Mr. Kessel stressed the need for a tracking system to ensure that the proper procedures are being followed on the GIS system so that there are no gaps. John Lutz explained that there is such a tracking system in place for subdivisions.

Mr. Kessel stressed the importance of having a package detailing the routine to follow for new subdivisions which would help

developers, builders, etc. to know what is expected. Sue Adams stated there is such a packet that MPC uses in their economic development package and felt that it could be adapted to this use.

Mr. Lutz stated that Keith Stump the Database Manager has worked with MPC, City Engineering, and the Property Assessor's office on the method for putting subdivisions in the system and there is a tracking system available.

Mr. Kessel stressed the importance of keeping the system current. Mr. Kessel requested that at the next meeting a workflow be made available to ensure that everyone is getting what they need. Mr. Lutz continued with the status update by informing the Policy Board of the proposed addressing ordinance. The addressing ordinance passed on the first reading to the City Council and will be presented to County Commission at the next meeting. Mr. Lutz stated that this ordinance establishes a county-wide street naming system for addressing and should eventually eliminate duplicate street names. In addition the ordinance requires that correct addresses be posted on houses, businesses, etc. and establishes some enforcement procedures.

Mr. Lutz also mentioned that the GIS is working with the Knox County School system on the desegregation plan. He also mentioned that the addressing software is in place and addresses can now be assigned on the system.

Mr. Lutz stated that he and Keith Stump would be going to Huntsville the following day to discuss the problems that the GIS has been having with software.

Mr. Hoskins referred back to the addressing ordinance and asked if there would be any publicity about it so that the public might be informed. Mr. Kessel suggested that both the City and County make news releases to inform the public of the new ordinance. Mayor Ashe suggested that Mr. Lutz get with George Korda and John Evans to discuss media coverage.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Tuesday, November 13, 1990 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.



## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

November 13, 1990 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, Chairman, General Manager, KUB, Hon. Victor Ashe, Mayor City of Knoxville; Arriving after call to order, Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Jim Moore, Director, Administrative Services, MPC; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, MPC; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Finance; Mr. Jim York, City Finance; Mr. Dick Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; and Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information Systems.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, September 12, 1990 were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative. (Hon. Dwight Kessel not present).

After the approval of the minutes, Mr. Hoskins asked if the addressing ordinance which was discussed at the last meeting had been approved by both the City and County. Mr. Lutz explained that the addressing ordinance was now law since it had passed two readings of City Council and three readings of the County Commission. Mr. Hoskins stated that the public should be made aware of the new ordinance. Mayor Ashe suggested that Sam Parnell get with George Korda to talk with him about possible ways to inform the public of the new ordinance.

#### GIS HOLIDAY SCHEDULE

Mr. Lutz explained that this was a proposal to change the present GIS holiday schedule to correspond with the County's proposed new holiday schedule. Mr. Lutz further explained that the GIS staff currently follows other County policies and procedures with regard to benefits, and it was felt by the Technical Committee that it was better to adopt a single convention than have numerous different holiday schedules. The proposed new holiday schedule for the County has not been approved, but includes the addition of Martin Luther King's Birthday, President's Day, and the day after Thanksgiving which would be observed as Columbus Day. Mr. Lutz stated that the new holiday schedule if approved would add a net of 2 days, President's Day and the day after Thanksgiving to the GIS holidays. Martin Luther King's Birthday is currently observed by the GIS staff so this day would not be added. Mayor Ashe asked

if the County still planned to observe election days as holidays. Mr. Lutz stated that the County would not be observing election days as holidays if the proposed schedule was passed. Mayor Ashe then asked what the KUB holiday schedule was at present time. Mr. Hoskins stated that currently the KUB observes 9 fixed holidays and 3 personal holidays. The City currently has 9 holidays. Mr. Lutz further explained that a member of the GIS staff currently works any GIS holiday which is not observed by all of the users. This person can then use holiday time at a later date. This item was tabled until the County officially adopted their new holiday schedule. The Mayor suggested that a decision be made at the January meeting. (Hon. Dwight Kessel arrives.)

#### **ALLOCATION OF AERIAL PHOTO RESERVES FOR MAP UPDATES**

Mr. Lutz displayed a map of the area which was reflowed in the spring. He explained that each map sheet is color coded showing the type of update needed (i.e., light planimetric, heavy planimetric). Mr. Lutz pointed out the area which has already been approved for updating, at the cost of \$114,000.00. Mr. Lutz stated that updating this one area leaves three areas which have been photographed, still in need of updating, the cost of updating these areas would be approximately \$125,000.00. Mr. Lutz explained that there is \$180,000.00 remaining of the bond issue which the Policy Board appropriated for the update project. Current expenditures include \$17,000.00 for photography, \$2,200.00 for prints, \$3,700.00 for indexes, \$25,000.00 for enlargements, \$8,000.00 for test sheets, and \$5,000.00 for project start-up. The cost of updating the total area flown would be \$300,440.75. If the \$180,000.00 remaining in the bond fund is subtracted from this amount, the balance of \$120,440.75 needed to complete the total area could be taken from the aerial photo reserve fund. The aerial photo reserve fund currently has a balance of \$140,000.00 and will at the end of the fiscal year in June have another \$70,000.00 plus whatever interest will accrue to the balance.

Mr. Hoskins asked how these costs were determined. Mr. Lutz explained that the costs were established through negotiations with Baker Engineers who did the original conversion. Mr. Hoskins then asked if the GIS might get a better price if the conversion was sent out for competitive bids. Mr. Lutz stated that he did not think the GIS could beat the price because there would be additional costs to a new vendor. Start-up costs for a new vendor would be high because they would need to get specifications and write conversion software to work with our existing equipment and software. Also, the start-up time involved for a new vendor would be a factor. The GIS spent 9 months working with Baker Engineers on the original conversion start-up.

Mr. Hoskins asked if the GIS was captive of Baker Engineers. Mr. Lutz stated that he did not think so. Mr. Lutz recommended that when the GIS did go out for bid, that it be done for up to a three year period. This would give the vendor the potential for a three year commitment over which to recover their start-up costs. Mr. Hoskins then asked if the current prices were in line with the original costs. Mr. Lutz explained that the prices were actually

less than the original costs because Baker is updating and not compiling the whole map sheet.

Mr. Hoskins stated that at some point the GIS does need to go out for competitive bids. The Mayor agreed with Mr. Hoskins and asked if there was a time frame in mind to do this. Mr. Lutz also agreed that competitive bids were needed but stated that this particular update has already been awarded to Baker by extension of the previous contract. The Policy Board approved this extension of the contract at a previous meeting. The plan was to go out for bid in January 1991 for upcoming updates. The Mayor asked if this was possible since this was mid-November. The Mayor said he would like to see the bids go out or be in the process of going out at the January Policy Board meeting. Mr. Lutz stated that he would take care of this matter and report back to the Policy Board in January. He further stated that it was his preference to bid the aerial photography with the conversion so that the conversion vendor would be responsible for the aerial photography.

Mr. Kessel asked if the software needed to link with the GIS software would also be put out for competitive bid. Mr. Lutz explained that the GIS Department sets the specifications for what the data must look like and the vendor is responsible for developing their own in-house proprietary software to enable them to take the photography and develop the product data files. The GIS, therefore, has no interest in the software since it is vendor specific. Any vendor the GIS selects would have to have already done the process or write new software to meet GIS specifications. Mayor Ashe asked that a status report be given at the January meeting concerning the bid for aerial photo updates for the coming year.

Mr. Parnell asked if the area on the map had already been flown. Mr. Lutz stated that the area was flown, the enlargements of the map sheets have been generated and compared to the existing maps, and the update needed on each map has been determined. Mr. Lutz stated that originally he had planned to limit the update to only part of the area reflown which would keep the expenses lower and not require use of the aerial photo reserve fund.

Mr. Lutz made the proposal that \$120,440.75 be allocated from the aerial photo reserve fund to complete the conversion of the entire area reflown. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee felt that the whole area should be completed since the money has already been spent to fly the photography and make the comparisons. Mr. Kessel made a motion to allocate the \$120,440.75 from the aerial photo reserve fund to complete conversion of the entire area that was reflown. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in favor of the motion.

#### **INTERGRAPH SOFTWARE**

John Lutz stated that at the last Policy Board meeting he had mentioned that the GIS was having problems with the Intergraph software that manages the land records. Mr. Lutz stated that after the last Policy Board meeting, Keith Stump, GIS Database Manager,



and himself went to the Intergraph offices in Huntsville, Alabama to talk with software support personnel about some of the problems the GIS is having with the land records software. Mr. Lutz stated that some of these problems are the same ones that were reported beginning as early as March of 1990 continuing on through the present date. A corporate decision made by Intergraph to move in another direction, means they are not going to enhance the software that the GIS currently uses. Intergraph has agreed to make some minimal fixes so that the software is functional and the information can be kept up-to-date. However, they are not going to enhance it's capabilities to make it a truly usable piece of software.

Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz for his recommendation concerning this matter. Mr. Lutz stated that at this time he had no recommendation, but wanted the Policy Board to be aware of the status of the problems.

Mr. Lutz further stated that the GIS is looking at alternative courses to take concerning the software problems. Intergraph does have new software and plans to provide a pathway for the GIS to make a transition to the new software. Mr. Lutz stated that at this point he thinks the GIS should take a closer look at Intergraph, at the GIS capabilities, and possibly what other vendors might have to offer. Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS has some of Intergraph's new software and it is currently being evaluated. The GIS has also made arrangements with another vendor to receive software on loan so that it can be tested to evaluate its capabilities. The GIS is also investigating the possibility of using the software that KUB uses (FRAMME). The GIS would use FRAMME to develop software to handle the land records. This particular option is attractive because it would work well with KUB's software. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee, Drew Lancaster, and Jerry Julian are working on this problem.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz explained that the County has insurance coverage on their computer equipment and he has been asked if the GIS would like to be covered under their policy. Mr. Lutz explained that the GIS is currently not covered under any policy which has just been an oversight. Mr. Lutz asked the Policy Board if they would like for him to pursue getting an insurance policy to cover the computer hardware that the GIS currently owns. Mayor Ashe asked if the equipment was covered now, and Mr. Lutz said no it was not covered at the present time. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Hoskins how the KUB was covered. Mr. Hoskins explained that the KUB was insured against fire and water damage with a high minimum and a deductible. Mr. Hoskins further stated that the computers were insured separately against fire and water damage. Mr. Hoskins asked if the GIS could tack on to the County's policy. Mr. Lutz stated that the County indicated that the GIS could be covered under the County's insurance policy. Mr. Kessel stated that yes the GIS could be covered under the County policy that there would be no problem. Mayor Ashe asked what would be the cost involved. Mr. Lutz



explained that the cost is .043 cents per hundred dollars which would amount to about \$1400.00 a year total. Mr. Lutz explained that the deductible is \$25,000.00 for 1 million in coverage. Mayor Ashe asked what the total investment in GIS equipment was, and what the replacement costs would be. Mr. Lutz stated that the total investment in equipment is about 1.5 million and that replacement costs are usually lower with computer equipment. Mr. Lutz stated that he thought that the insurance covered the cost of setting up at a different location so that operations could continue. Mayor Ashe made the motion that the GIS get insurance to cover the equipment up to its full replacement value. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Lutz asked for clarification concerning the motion. Mr. Hoskins explained that he was to go ahead with the purchase of insurance and report his actions to the Policy Board at the next meeting. Mr. Kessel added Mr. Lutz could call a short meeting of the Policy Board if there was a problem.

Mr. Lutz stated that he had two more items to report on. Mr. Lutz explained that the GIS is still looking for an Assistant System Manager and has not yet found a suitable candidate. He informed the Policy Board that he did have some new candidates and hoped to find someone soon.

Mr. Lutz stated that the next item that he wanted to mention briefly was a meeting with the Town of Farragut, the First Utility District, and the Concord Telephone Exchange. The meeting was to discuss the new policy concerning Level II Participants. Mr. Lutz stated that he thought the meeting went well. Drew Lancaster of KUB gave a demonstration on the system and everyone seemed impressed. Mr. Lutz stated that he thinks these utilities will move toward being Level II participants beginning with First Utility District, and then the Town of Farragut soon after.

Mr. Lutz stated that at this meeting there was one item mentioned that he was not able to address. Mr. Lutz explained that he was asked what the costs would be if the utilities purchased the data only. Mr. Hoskins asked if this had been worked out yet. Mr. Lutz explained that no this had not been worked out because the GIS had planned on having the input of these utilities instead of selling the data only. Mr. Lutz felt that the utilities were happy with the prices for becoming a Level II participant and he recommended at this time they be told that there is not a provision for selling the data.

Mr. Hoskins asked about the status of the work being done on the public information act. Mr. Lutz stated that there has been no progress made on the act but that he is still trying to get Plangraphics, Inc. involved in the project. There was some discussion about the legalities of the Act and how costs should be determined. All members agreed that it would be in the best interest of the GIS to be involved in this work.

Mr. Hoskins stated that at a previous Policy Board meeting the members had agreed to rotate the chairmanship on an annual basis. Mr. Hoskins made a proposal that at the beginning of 1991 there be a new chairman. Mr. Kessel made a motion to elect Mayor Ashe as the new chairman for 1991. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, January 28, 1991 at 2:00 p.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

January 28, 1991 at 2:00 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB, Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Jim Moore, Director, Administrative Services, MPC; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, MPC; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Mr. Jim York, City Finance; Mr. Dick Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; and Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information Systems.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the GIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, November 13, 1990 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### STATUS OF RFP FOR MAP UPDATE SERVICES

Mr. Lutz stated that at the last meeting a decision was made by the Policy Board to send the aerial photography and conversion for 1991 out for competitive bid. Mayor Ashe had asked at the last meeting that Mr. Lutz give a status report regarding the request for proposal. Mr. Lutz stated that the request for proposal was sent out to seven vendors in the business of photogrammetry and conversion. The proposals are due back in the KGIS office by February 12, 1991. Mr. Lutz explained that this date will run close to the deadline but that he did not see a problem with getting the aerial photography flown this spring.

#### USAGE BASED COST ALLOCATION

Mr. Lutz explained that the issue of usage based cost allocation is one that the Technical Committee has been discussing for some time. He explained that in the Tri-Party Agreement states that once the system becomes operational, that the operating costs are to be divided among the users of the system in proportion to their

usage.

Mr. Lutz stated that there are two key issues involved in getting the cost allocation set up. One issue is deciding when the system is considered operational and that is a decision to be made by the Policy Board. The second issue is how to set up the technical mechanism for figuring each users relative usage.

Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee had set up a subcommittee to deal with these issues. This committee includes: David Reece of KUB, Kathy Hamilton of County Finance, Jim York of City Finance, Jim Moore of MPC, and himself. The purpose of the subcommittee is to determine the mechanism for arriving at the costs for each user once the system is declared operational by the Policy Board. This subcommittee will be responsible for determining the cost of each unit such as CPU time, memory demand, and disk space usage.

Mr. Lutz stated that the implementation of cost allocation is important because it will determine the costs for those outside users that we hope to be adding to the GIS system in the future. There has been some disagreement as to when the system should be considered operational.

Mr. Kessel asked if there was enough data available to determine costs. He also asked if a trade off of information would be considered in lieu of charges. Mr. Lutz explained that the data is available, but no decision has been made as to what to charge for each item. Mr. Lutz explained that there has been some discussion about accounting for usage every month based on 100% usage. This means that the monthly costs would be divided out according to everyone's relative usage. This is a method that the accounting people seem to like. Mr. Hoskins stated that this method did not seem fair because there are some groups who are not using the system. Mr. Hoskins explained that under this system the group who used the system would pay double for the group who did not use the system during a particular month. Mr. Kessel stated that the intention was that everyone would be using the system. Mr. Hoskins stated that until everyone was using the system there should be a minimum charge or a demand charge to protect those who do utilize the system. Mr. Lutz stated that the minimum charge was a good idea and also charging for disk space was another option.

Mr. Lutz explained that we were talking about allocating operating expenses which in this past year have been around \$700,000. Mr. Lutz stated that the decision was made earlier to split the operating expenses by usage and split the principal and interest payments in three equal shares. Mr. Kessel explained that the intention was at the beginning to take the operating expenses and deduct any revenue received. Mr. Kessel stated that the assumption was if a group used the system 60% of the time than they should carry 60% of the load because of storage requirements and accessibility. Mr. Kessel stated that KUB was the largest user followed by the County and then the City. Mr. Kessel stated that as far as the county was concerned that he didn't have any problem with going on usage based allocation and dividing the unaccounted for costs. Mr. Hoskins asked if this was only until we reached 100% usage.

Mr. Kessel stated that if we went on minimum charge then that becomes one of direct subsidy by somebody. Mr. Lutz stated that one of the problems with not being able to charge with usage is that it gives no control over someone's ability to monopolize the resources.

Mr. Kessel stated that the intention was originally for each user to buy their time and that money would go in a pot. Then any revenue would come off the top before the difference was divided based on the amount of demand the system had. In other words the users would be paying a percentage of the net costs. David Reece from KUB stated that he thought this would be a reasonable thing to do. Mr. Reece felt like this method was appropriate when everyone was utilizing the system. This would prevent penalizing those people who had been aggressive and were further ahead than some of the other users.

Mr. Kessel asked if the City Engineering Department was operational. Mr. Sam Parnell stated that the office of Planning and Technical Services was on line and several of the other divisions were coming along. Mr. Parnell stated that he would consider the Department of Engineering operational.

Mayor Ashe asked if there was any motion to be adopted. Mr. Lutz stated no that he had only opened this item for discussion. He stated that at some point a decision would have to be made.

Mr. Kessel stated that what the KGIS might have to do for a short period of time is charge a minimum usage until everyone was on line.

Mr. Kessel suggested that the subcommittee continue working on this item.

#### **HOLIDAY SCHEDULE**

Mr. Lutz stated that this item was mentioned at the last meeting and the Policy Board had decided to put off discussing it until the January meeting. The proposal made at the last meeting was for the KGIS Department to switch to the new County holiday schedule. Mayor Ashe stated that he and John had discussed this prior to the meeting and felt like the KUB holiday schedule of nine holidays and three floating personal days would be the most appropriate.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion to change the KGIS holiday schedule to observe the common KUB holidays and add three additional personal days. Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Lutz further stated that the KGIS had committed to have someone working any time the KUB, City or County offices were open.

#### **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz stated that Kathy Hamilton, Director of County Finance,



had planned on giving a financial status report on the sinking funds but that she was out sick. Mr. Kessel requested that if Kathy had something that she should send it out to the Policy Board instead of waiting to the next meeting.

The second item mentioned was concerning insurance. Mr. Lutz stated at the last Policy Board the members had approved purchasing insurance to cover the KGIS equipment. Mr. Lutz that the insurance was purchased and the premium total was \$606.00. This policy insures the KGIS equipment for up to \$1,500,000.00. Mr. Lutz felt like this was adequate coverage for replacing existing equipment.

Mr. Lutz stated that two new employees were added to the KGIS staff. John Edwards was hired to fill the Assistant System Manager position and he began work on January 7th. John worked part-time this past summer comparing new aerial photos to existing maps. John is a graduate of the University of Tennessee and will be undergoing training over the next several months. Mr. Lutz also introduced Susan Carter who will fill the position of Administrative Assistant while Robin Holt is on maternity leave. Mr. Lutz explained that Susan is living in Knoxville while her husband is in the Middle East.

Mr. Lutz explained that at the last meeting he had reported incorrectly that the addressing ordinance had been passed. He further explained that the ordinance was passed as an amendment to the zoning ordinance and is now in the process of being passed as a free standing ordinance. Ms. Sue Adams of MPC reported that the ordinance has passed one of the three readings of County Commission.

Mr. Kessel asked about the status of the software problems with Intergraph which were discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Lutz stated that some of the fixes had been received but cannot be loaded on the system because the operating system will also have to be upgraded. At this time the KGIS can not upgrade the operating system because the Intergraph software which KUB uses is not ready for the upgrade. Mr. Lutz explained that Intergraph's decision to move away from the VAX has slowed down the progress of the upgrade. Mr. Kessel asked what they were using and Mr. Lutz stated that Intergraph is now trying to sell their own workstations. Mr. Lutz explained that these type decisions are marketing decisions and there is not a whole lot that can be done about them.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, March 13, 1991 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

March 13, 1991 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT;** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville; Arriving after call to order, Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Ms. Sue Adams, Director, MPC; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Finance; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering; Mr. Dick Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting, January 28, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### AERIAL PHOTO AND CONVERSION CONTRACT

Mr. Lutz stated that the KGIS had completed the RFP process and had received proposals from four different firms. Mr. Lutz explained that the number was narrowed to three and these three were asked to come to Knoxville and make a presentation. Mr. Lutz stated that the KGIS Technical Committee, after a thorough review, had decided to recommend contracting with the low bidder, Mid States Engineering (MSE) out of Indianapolis, Indiana. Mr. Lutz explained that KUB has used MSE for electrical and now gas conversion and they have been quite satisfied. Mr. Lutz stated that a contract has been written and that the Policy Board needs to approve the choice of Mid States as the contractor, the contract, and the Mayor (as Policy Board Chairman) needs to sign the contract.

Mayor Ashe asked who was the low bidder. Mr Lutz explained that it was hard to say which firm had the low bid, because the firms submitted rates, per flight line mile, per photograph, per stereo model and per map sheet. Mr. Lutz explained that the rates given in the RFP were applied to an area in the 1990 update for the

purpose of comparing rates. Mr. Lutz stated that applying MSE rates to the area, the cost would have been approximately 150,000.00 versus, approximately 170,000.00 for the next lowest vendor.

Mr. Hoskins asked if the contract had been reviewed by someone from the County Law Department. Mr. Lutz stated that the contract had been reviewed by the County Law Department. Mr. Lutz further stated that some negotiating had taken place with Mid States regarding the warranty sections of the contract. Mayor Ashe asked if the County Law Department had approved the contract. Mr. Lutz stated that yes, the Law Department had approved the contract.

Mr. Lutz stated that there were some reservations as to whether MSE could adequately compile the digital terrain model and contours. Mr. Lutz explained that the contract allows for a test of these capabilities before the final go ahead is given. MSE is proceeding with flying the aerial photography. MSE will perform the test for the KGIS on a couple of sheets to make sure they can meet the standards. Mr. Lutz explained that if they meet the standards then the KGIS will continue on with the contract, if not, the KGIS can contract with another firm.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion that the low bid of Mid States Engineering be approved by the Board. Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### **PROPOSED AREA FOR 1991 UPDATE**

Mr. Lutz displayed the area that was flown and updated in March of 1990 and the area scheduled for flying this spring. Mr. Lutz said that at the last Technical Committee meeting the proposed update area was discussed and the members were asked for feedback regarding any problems or suggestions about the area being flown. Mr. Lutz stated that no one had expressed any problems.

Mr. Lutz explained that an additional 10,000 foot strip of mapsheets would be added to those reviewed by the Technical Committee. Mr. Lutz stated that this area would not add significantly to the cost. Mr. Lutz further stated that the areas covered in this update include the Halls area, which is growing rapidly, and most of the rest of the City that did not get photographed last year.

Mr. Lutz stated that this particular area was the project area that was sent out to Mid States Engineering. Mr. Lutz explained that if there were problems with this area it was not too late to make changes to the area.

Mayor Ashe asked if anyone had any comments or problems with what Mr. Lutz proposed.

Mr. Kessel asked if the area that Mr. Lutz showed on the map was the area that was flown this year. Mr. Lutz stated that it was. Mr. Lutz then explained that the project area would include four columns of mapsheets to the east. Mr. Kessel asked if the KGIS had based their selection on areas of growth as preference, or were they trying to rotate through the county. Mr. Lutz went on to explain that the KGIS initially identified the growth areas, and that the KGIS is still following the order that was initially identified. Mr. Lutz went on to explain that there was quite a bit of growth in the Halls area. Mr. Lutz stated that the flight could go on further west, and that possibly next year that particular area to the west would be updated. Mr. Lutz explained that the KGIS department was hoping that more progress would be made on the Pellissippi Parkway before the next update, and the KGIS was also hoping to get Farragut to become a participant.

Mayor Ashe asked who the contact person was for Farragut. Mr. Lutz answered, Bill Hammond. Mr. Lutz went on to explain that Farragut seemed to be interested in joining the KGIS. Mr. Kessel stated it would be to their advantage to join and Mr. Lutz agreed. Mr. Lutz explained that in the past couple of days he had talked with people at Hallsdale-Powell and they expressed a desire for the costs to be less.

Mr. Kessel explained that alot of people think they would be stuck with the cost of the system, and he went on to explain that the system is set up based on usage and that is what the KGIS had originally planned. He explained that in a usage based system users are only charged for the resources they use.

Mr. Lutz stated that KGIS does plan to have a license fee that is charged each year, which is a base rate, and then usage would be charged above that. Mr. Lutz explained that the purpose of the license, is to recoup some of the initial cost. The KGIS has also set a minimum usage rate, which is based on the amount of money that the KGIS has set aside for aerial photo updates. The KGIS wants all participants to contribute a portion of that according to the amount of area in their jurisdiction.

Mr. Lutz explained that he has heard several stories from different people who say they can get a PC and plotter for \$10,000.00, and they could start digitizing. Mr. Lutz stated how much it would cost them to get it digitized, if they could ever get it completed. Mr. Lutz went on to explain that the ones that have tried this realize that the KGIS is a pretty good bargain.

Mayor Ashe asked if Mr. Lutz needed a motion to approve update of this area. Mr. Lutz stated no, unless anyone had problems this area would be used for the updates.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the area for updating and Mr Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.



Mr. Kessel had an additional comment. Mr. Kessel stated, that anyone interested in the KGIS, such as, Farragut and Hallsdale-Powell could send a key person, who would be their contact, to the KGIS Policy Board meetings to see firsthand what is being done. Mr. Lutz stated that he had suggested the same to Hallsdale-Powell, and he thought someone would be at this meeting. Mr. Kessel stated that attending the meetings might help them better understand the costs involved in the KGIS.

#### **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director of County Finance, gave the KGIS financial report. Ms. Hamilton stated that there has been a change this year as far as the presentation. The KGIS has decided to separate the Operating Fund and the Aerial Photography and Equipment Reserve Fund. Ms. Hamilton explained that there are still some corrections to be made to the report. She stated that when the auditors separated the funds, two errors were found. When closing accounts at year end, John Lutz discovered that some of the money was posted incorrectly between equipment and aerial photography reserves. Ms. Hamilton stated that County Finance has corrected this on their records and will provide the auditors with the changes. Also, when the funds were separated, the budget amounts attributable to aerial photography and equipment reserves were not transferred. She explained that, though it is shown as a non-budgeted item, it is budgeted and the amount has been left as budgeted in the Operating Fund. Ms. Hamilton stated that County Finance would go correct the report and provide a corrected presentation.

Ms. Hamilton explained that the board members would be able to track exactly what contributions are made to each fund. She explained that this will be very important next fiscal year because you will be able to see expenditures being made from the Equipment and Aerial Photography Reserve Fund separate from the Operating Fund. This will provide better accounting.

Ms. Hamilton stated that there is a fund balance in the Operating Fund and that is anticipated to be carried into the next year. The carryover is to avoid billing participants the first quarter's budgeted expenses in advance. Ms. Hamilton stated that John Lutz recommended that it would be more realistic to carry forward the fund balance and delay billing until the end of the first quarter because an advance bill would total more than the \$118,000 fund balance.

Mayor Ashe asked what interest rate the funds were earning. Ms. Hamilton stated that we were earning market rate because the funds were in current CDs. She explained that it was planned to establish an LGIP account for KGIS and that an application had been placed with the State. The board members would get a report monthly instead of quarterly. It was discussed that the interest rate is based on the average return of various pooled investments and because of this the rates tend to both drop and rise slower than the market.



Mr. Hoskins discussed additional changes to the reporting which would disclose the amount which has been invested for KGIS equipment. Mr. Kessel agreed that it would be important for anyone interested in participating in the KGIS to be aware of the money that has already been invested in equipment. Mr. Kessel also recommended that people interested in the system be invited to tour the KGIS facility. This would provide an opportunity to show the capabilities of the system and the investment in equipment and software.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to have the financial report entered in and recorded in the minutes. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Lutz stated that both the City and County now have an addressing ordinance. Mr. Lutz explained that at the last Technical Committee meeting Sam Parnell from City Engineering and Jim Moore from MPC agreed to work with George Korda and John Evans to get publicity out about the City and County's new addressing ordinance which requires residents to post their address on their house and have a valid address to obtain building permits, etc.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday May 13, 1991 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

May 30, 1991 at 2:00 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT;** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Jim Moore, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Finance; Mr. Jim York, City Finance; Mr. Dick Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of March 13, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### KGIS BUDGET

Mr. Lutz asked if everyone had received the handout (attached) with a budget summary and a comparison of this year's to last year's budget. Mr. Lutz asked if there were any questions concerning the budget. Mr. Hoskins asked if the new budget was based on last year's budget or on actual expenditures. Mr. Lutz stated that this year's budget was done from scratch and was not based entirely on the previous budgeted amounts. He added that the figures were based on actual expenses. Mr. Hoskins commented that there was significant increases in certain items.

Mr. Lutz explained that the increase of 8.8% in salaries over this year's actual expenditures was due to a position that was budgeted for the entire year but not filled until December, 1990. He also explained that there was a 4.5% cost of living adjustment (COLA) included in the salary figures. He explained that the fringe benefit figure was based on a formula that came from County Finance. The amount budgeted for fringe benefits was more than the actual expenditures, partially because of the position that was not filled until later in the year. He stated that the rate for fringe benefits had stayed the same this year.

Mr. Lutz explained that the Operating Expenses were up 30% due mostly to the increase in supplies needed to run the plotter. The total amount budgeted is \$42,000.00 and \$36,000.00 of this amount is for plotter supplies and computer tapes. Mr. Lutz added that the figures were based on what the KGIS Department currently uses and the prices paid for these supplies. Mr. Lutz stated that the other items under operating expenses are the same as last year.

Mayor Ashe asked what the cost of living figures were based on. Mr. Lutz explained that a 4.5% was budgeted, even though the Consumer Price Index rose 5.01%, because that is what the KGIS received last year and considering current economic conditions a larger increase was considered unfeasible. Mr. Lutz explained that traditionally the Policy Board adopts the budget and then comes back in July and sets the cost of living increase. In July the cost of living increase is generally set according to what the City, County, and KUB received. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Hoskins what KUB would be receiving for the coming year. Mr. Hoskins replied that a decision had not been reached yet, but that a 5% increase in total labor was recommended in the budget. He explained that the entire 5% would not be allocated to COLA increases, but some would be allocated toward merit increases. He stated that the COLA increase would be about 4.5%. Mayor Ashe stated that 3% had been given to City personnel. Mayor Ashe then asked Mr. Kessel what the County would be receiving. Mr. Kessel replied that based on what he knew the County would not receive anything. Mr. Kessel stated that he was not sure at this time but would know something soon. Mayor Ashe asked how the Policy Board usually arrived at the COLA increase. He asked if it was done by an average of the three. Mr. Lutz explained that it would be up to the Board to decide how the figure was determined. He further explained that in the past the City, County, and KUB COLA increases have always been the same or very close so it never really made a difference. Mr. Kessel commented that this year there would be quite a difference. Mr. Lutz commented that with 0, 3%, and 4.5% there would be a significant spread.

Mr. Lutz skipped ahead and mentioned that the July 8, 1991 Policy Board meeting had been changed due to a conflict. The new date being July 3, 1991 at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Lutz went on to say that he recommended that the COLA increase be decided at the July 3 meeting.

Mr. Lutz then went on to explain another item in the budget which had increased. This item being the amount that is set aside in the Aerial Photo Reserve fund. This Fund is set aside to pay for updates to the maps. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee felt that based on recent experience this amount needed to be increased from \$70,000.00 to \$100,000.00. The Technical Committee decided that \$100,000.00 was a more realistic number based upon actual costs in the previous updates. Mr. Lutz then stated that the total increase including operating, reserve funds, and maintenance were \$67,000.00. The Aerial Reserve fund had an increase of \$30,000.00 and the other \$38,000.00 (\$37,000.00) was in the operations. Mr. Hoskins asked if there were any places that could be looked at for reduction such as the maintenance contract. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee had been looking at several options for reducing the maintenance costs. Option 1

would include selling the MicroVax 250 which would reduce maintenance costs by \$12,000.00 a year. He explained with this option some money would have to be spent to buy a software compiler. The money for the software compiler would have to come from the Equipment Reserve fund. Option 2 would be to drop maintenance on the 250 and go on per call maintenance and the KGIS would only pay when the machine broke. This option would reduce maintenance to \$600.00 a year on the 250.

Mr. Lutz further stated that one option for reducing maintenance costs which might be considered is dropping software maintenance on the VAX. Intergraph has announced that they are no longer going to enhance any VAX-based software, this means that we have got what we are going to get, but Intergraph is still wanting to charge us maintenance. Mr. Hoskins stated that he felt like the KGIS was paying high maintenance. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz what his recommendation was regarding this issue. Mr. Lutz explained that the way to save money on maintenance is to move into the workstation environment with Intergraph. Mr. Lutz further stated that old technology means high maintenance dollars. Mr. Lutz added that the maintenance costs for individual pieces of equipment have not increased over the past two years, but that the KGIS has added more equipment. The new workstations which basically have as much power as the VAX costs \$15,000.00 compared to \$850,000.00 and the maintenance is \$125.00 a month instead of \$6800.00 Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee has been looking into this matter. Mr. Kessel stated that if the 250 still has some capabilities and if the resale value is low the KGIS should consider keeping it. Mr. Lutz added that the primary reason for high maintenance costs is that we are maintaining a 2 year old system.

Mr. Lutz stated that he did not think that switching to third party maintenance was an option because most of the users would not accept one day or second day service. Mr. Kessel asked Mr. Lutz if he would have recommendations concerning this matter at the July 3 meeting. Mr. Lutz said he would recommend something at the next meeting.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to adopt the budget as a tentative budget and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of the motion.

#### **EQUIPMENT RESERVE FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION**

Mr. Lutz stated that he needed authorization to spend funds out of the Equipment Reserve to purchase a router which is a communications device which allows the system to hook up to remote sites such as KUB. The cost of this router would be \$7,085.00 The second item is a 8 mm tape backup unit. This unit is a fairly new type of device which will allow the KGIS to backup information on smaller cartridges instead of the large reel tapes. Mr. Lutz added that 11 of the large reels could be stored on 1 of the small cartridges thus saving space. The cartridges are cheaper than the cost of 11 large reel tapes and the process used to perform backup to the cartridges require less time. Mr. Lutz explained that the cost of this system would not exceed \$25,000.00 but he would like to go out for competitive bid.



Mr. Lutz proposed that the Policy Board authorize spending up to \$25,000 for this tape backup unit and in the meantime he would receive bids on the unit. Mr. Lutz also proposed the authorization of \$7,085 for the remote router. The total cost of the two items would be \$32,085.

At this time Mr. Hoskins asked if these items were included in the budget. Mr. Lutz answered no and explained that these items were a capital purchase out of the Equipment Reserve fund. Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. Lutz why he did not budget for these type of purchases. Kathy Hamilton told Mr. Lutz that he needed to record this as a budgeted expenditure. Ms. Hamilton explained that there are no budgeted expenditures unless the Policy Board approves them, but she added that Mr. Lutz did need to make an amendment to the budget to include these items.

Mayor Ashe stated that this did raise a point. He further stated that in the City they were able to budget for capital expenditures for the coming year. Mr. Hoskins then asked if this meant that we could spend \$178,000 out of the Equipment Reserve fund and we would not have to budget for it. Mr. Kessel explained that no new money would have to be budgeted. The money is there in the Equipment Reserve fund it would only have to be appropriated. Mr. Lutz explained that this is not done on a yearly basis because it is hard to predict what equipment might be added during the year. Another reason for not including this item in the budget is because there has never been any money spent out of the Equipment Reserve because we have been using the remaining bond fund monies. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz if he anticipated spending any more money out of the Reserve Fund over the next year. Mr. Lutz replied that yes there might be a workstation purchased out of the Equipment Reserve. Mr. Lutz explained that it would depend on what equipment other departments ordered. Mr. Hoskins asked if Mr. Lutz could present a capital budget along with the operating budget. Mr. Lutz agreed that he could present a capital budget, but he again explained that it would be hard to predict what the KGIS might need to purchase over the next year. Mayor Ashe stated that the capital budget would only serve as a guide and would be subject to change.

Mr. Kessel then made a motion to authorize the bid process for the equipment and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

#### **PAYMENT TO MSE**

Mr. Lutz stated that at a previous meeting the Policy Board had approved awarding the contract for aerial photography and conversion services to MSE. Mr. Lutz explained that at that time the money to pay for these services should have been appropriated out of the Aerial Photography Reserve fund and was not.

Mr. Lutz made a recommendation that \$70,000 be appropriated to pay for these services. Mr. Hoskins asked if this would be a capital expenditure. Mr. Lutz replied that it could be a capital expenditure or it could be maintenance. Mr. Kessel asked if it would be something done every year and Mr. Lutz replied yes.



Mr. Lutz stated that this money is in a Aerial Photography Reserve fund and in the past he always asked the Policy Board to appropriate the money to pay for the services. Mr. Kessel stated that the budget carried the Reserve in this case. Mr. Lutz stated that both Reserve Funds were shown in the budget.

Mr. Kessel then asked how often updates would be done. Mr. Lutz replied that some updates would be done every year or we would get way behind. Mr. Lutz stated that at this time we have about 6 years of updating to do on the areas targeted for update.

Mr. Lutz stated that Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. is finishing up on last years updates and MSE is starting on this years. The aerial photography has been flown and MSE is ready to start updating maps. The contract has been approved we only need to allocate the money to pay for the services. Mr. Kessel then asked if \$70,000.00 would be put back into the Aerial Photography Reserve this year. Mr. Lutz explained that \$70,000.00 would be put in this year in addition to the \$198,000.00 that is already there. Mr. Kessel stated that what Mr. Lutz needed to do was indicate the Reserves in the budget and show where they tie in. Mayor Ashe added that if this was an expense incurred every year then it should be reflected in the budget. Mr. Kessel stated that he felt like it was maintenance rather than cash flow. Mr. Hoskins felt like it should be included in operating.

Mayor Ashe asked what the total amounts were in the Reserve Funds. Ms. Hamilton replied that there was approximately \$198,000.00 in the Aerial Photo Reserve and she was not sure about the Equipment Reserve. Mr. Lutz stated that in June, 1990 there was \$149,00.000 in the Aerial Photo Reserve and \$286,000.00 in the Equipment Reserve. Mr. Lutz stated that since June, 1990 the interest that had accrued had been added to the funds in addition to \$70,000.00 which was added to the Aerial Photo Reserve and \$179,000.00 added to the Equipment Reserve. Mr. Hoskins asked if there was a reserve fund for operating expenses. Mr. Lutz stated that the Operating Reserve balance was 118,000. Ms. Hamilton stated that the money in these reserves was in different places. Mr. Kessel stated that the budget should show capital and reserves. In addition it should show a list of capital equipment and the estimated cost of that equipment. Mr. Lutz stated that he had included a list of equipment. Mr. Lutz then asked Ms. Hamilton if the auditors were going to add the equipment to the financial statement. Ms. Hamilton stated that the auditors would be adding the equipment to the financial statement as well as checking back against the bond fund money. Mayor Ashe requested that at the next meeting in July that Mr. Lutz submit a capital outlay budget for the coming year.

Mr. Lutz requested that in the meantime the Policy Board allocate the money to pay MSE for the services they have completed. Mr Lutz explained that the Policy Board had approved the contract and MSE had already flown the photography. MSE is waiting to be paid for the photography. Mr. Hoskins commented that if we owe the money then we need to pay them. Mr. Kessel stated that MSE should only be paid for the work they have competed. Mayor Ashe asked what was owed at this time. Mr. Lutz answered that \$30,000 would cover the charge for services completed up to the end of May.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve \$30,000 to pay for these services through May. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mayor Ashe then asked what the total amount would be for these services. Mr. Lutz said he was going to limit the amount to \$70,000.00 for updating and use less if possible. He stated that the KGIS would need to prioritize the areas that needed updating because he did not think they should exceed the amount set aside each year for updating.

#### **STATUS REPORT**

Mr. Lutz stated again that Intergraph announced that they will no longer enhance VAX software. Mr. Lutz said that there would be no personnel at Intergraph to maintain support. He also stated that the KGIS had been operating the Land Records Management (LRM) software without any support for a year and a half. Mr. Lutz stated that right now there seems to be 3 different options available to the KGIS. The options include: 1) getting a new vendor which would mean changing software and everything; 2) writing our own software; 3) or migrating to the workstation with Intergraph. Mr. Lutz explained that this issue is complicated by a lot of things, one of which is that the KUB software works pretty well; but, the KGIS can not maintain the land record database that KUB needs to access. Mr. Hoskins asked if this was an issue that the Technical Committee could address. Mr. Lutz stated that they have been discussing it and hope to have a recommendation soon. Mr. Reece stated that the KGIS is late in the life cycle on the products they have now and early in the life cycle on the new products. This also complicates the issue. Mr. Lutz explained that this problem is not particular to Intergraph because most vendors or moving toward the workstations. Mr. Lutz stated that he hopes that over the next 3-5 years the KGIS could move to one environment or another. Mr. Lutz stated that the LRM software is not functional because it was not meant to be used by two different departments accessing the same data. Mr. Lutz stated that the software might be fixable but Intergraph would not fix it. Mr. Hoskins added that if Mr. Lutz needed the Policy Board's assistance to notify them. Mr. Lutz stated that for now he only wanted them to be aware of the situation.

#### **FINANCIAL REPORT**

Ms. Hamilton stated that she wanted to bring the Policy Board up-to-date on what the Finance Department is doing. She stated that the auditors would be doing a full review and audit of all the equipment and a reconcile back to the original bond issue. Ms. Hamilton explained that they were using the same policy regarding capital as the County and that includes listing any item over a \$1000.00.

Mr. Kessel asked if there was some type of a form that could be used to plug in figures when they needed a status report. Ms. Hamilton stated that the Finance Department was working toward that because in the past there was no provision for reporting. Mr.

Hoskins asked if the KGIS was included in the County audit. Ms. Hamilton stated that yes they were included and the report would be under a separate cover addressed to the Policy Board. Mr. Lutz asked if this report would be out soon. Ms. Hamilton stated that last year's report was finished and they would be starting on this years within the next 45 days.

#### **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz stated that one additional item that he needed Board approval for was authorization to receive bids for the sale of the 250.

Mr. Kessel made the motion to receive bids and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of the motion.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, July 3, 1991 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

July 3, 1991 at 8:30 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT;** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Jim Moore, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Ms. Sue Adams, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, Knox County Finance; Mr. Dick Moran, Director, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of May 30, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

Mr. Lutz stated there had been some discussion at the last Policy Board Meeting concerning the maintenance contract and the excessive amount of maintenance costs. Mr. Lutz stated that since the last meeting he had spent a great deal of time analyzing various scenarios that would reduce maintenance costs. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee had looked at each scenario.

Scenario 1 would involve selling the MicroVax 250 and taking it off the maintenance contract. Mr. Lutz explained that it was important to keep it on maintenance until it is sold so that anyone buying it could have it put on maintenance without any extra charges. This would reduce maintenance costs by \$2000.00 a year. Scenario 2 would involve discontinuing software maintenance with Intergraph. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee had decided to postpone this option until some software fixes which were supposedly in the works, were delivered.



Mr. Lutz stated that at this time the Technical Committee recommended extending the current maintenance contract for three months until the software changes were made and the KGIS was more comfortable going without software maintenance. Mr. Lutz stated that it is hard to determine how much would be saved by discontinuing software maintenance because Intergraph does not price software maintenance separate from hardware maintenance. Mr. Lutz stated that he had some indications that 60% of the maintenance contract is for software and the other 40% is for hardware. Mr. Lutz further stated that he thought the GIS might be able to save 60% on CPU maintenance costs, but the actual savings would have to be negotiated with Intergraph. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee would continue working on decreasing maintenance costs during this current budget year. Mr. Lutz explained that the new budget handout which he passed out at the beginning of the meeting (attached) reflected the change of dropping the 250 off the maintenance contract. He stated that the reason the amount was not lower was because he had added maintenance costs of the new items which would be added during the course of the fiscal year. The net savings would be \$2000.00 a year. Mr. Lutz stated that he needed a resolution from the Policy Board to extend the current maintenance contract for three months during which time the Technical Committee would investigate ways to reduce the current maintenance charges.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion to extend the current maintenance contract for three months and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Kessel asked a question to clarify that the amount of \$166,038.00 had been reflected in the budget and included maintenance. Mr. Lutz explained that the \$166,038.00 included continuing the current contract for 12 months less 1,974.00 for the 250 maintenance charges. Mr. Lutz further explained that any reductions made during the year would come off the amount of \$166,038.00.

#### **KGIS BUDGET**

Mr. Lutz explained that the next item for discussion was the capital outlay budget. At the last Policy Board meeting it was discovered that there had been no capital outlay budget prepared. Mr. Lutz stated that he had since prepared a capital outlay budget (attached) and proceeded to give everyone a copy. Mr. Lutz explained each item on the capital outlay budget.

He explained that the Aerial Photography and Map Update amount would come from the Aerial Photo Reserve Fund. He explained that after discussion the Technical Committee decided that until the KGIS is caught up from the initial aerial photography that they should maximize all resources toward getting updated, therefore, the Technical Committee asks that the Policy Board allocate for aerial photography and conversion services for this coming year \$170,000.00 out of the approximately \$200,000.00 available from the Aerial Photo Reserve Fund. Mr. Lutz added that the KGIS might not need to spend the entire \$170,000.00, but if necessary the funds would be available.

Mr. Kessel asked about the maintenance or preservation of records. He suggested that the Technical Committee recommend a period in which records are set aside. He mentioned an article about the problems the Census Bureau had when recovering some old records for use in this year's census. Mr. Kessel suggested making a final copy of records once a year and labeling the tapes correctly. Mr. Kessel stressed the importance of keeping records for use in the future. He further stated that it might be better to do it more often than once a year. Mr. Lutz stated that this was a good idea and would be explored further in the future. He further stated that at the present time the KGIS stores everything on tapes monthly and has done so from the beginning of the conversion. Mr. Lutz stated that Mr. Kessel had made a good point because in the future it would be impossible to keep everything because of limited storage and excessive costs.

Mr. Kessel added that hard copies of records could be stored in Records Storage in the old Sears Building when it is complete.

Mr. Lutz mentioned the other items included in the capital outlay budget were hardware items including enhancements of hardware/software for the VAX 8810. It also includes workstation software enhancements and the cost of upgrading the existing workstation to one that will run more current software. Mr. Lutz stated that the total of these items was \$217,219.00. Mr. Hoskins asked what the column labeled future expenses contained. Mr. Lutz explained that he had included this column for information purposes and it contains maintenance costs per month for each item. Mr. Lutz added that these items had been included in the budget figure for maintenance costs. Mr. Hoskins asked if the Technical Committee had approved the budget. Mr. Lutz answered that yes the Technical Committee had approved the budget.

Mr. David Reece commented that the items included for boosting the VAX 8810 was what the Technical Committee wanted to do to get more out of the current system.

Mr. Lutz added that the \$170,000.00 for aerial photography and map updates would be the maximum spent. He further stated that the performance upgrades on the VAX 8810 would be taken in a step-wise fashion. He stated that the KGIS would start with the least expensive performance upgrade first and then evaluate the 8810's performance and proceed only if necessary. Mr. Hoskins asked if the funds were available in the Reserve funds and Mr. Lutz answered yes.

Mr. Hoskins moved to approve the KGIS capital outlay budget and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

#### **COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT**

Mr. Lutz stated that the budget that was approved at the last Policy Board Meeting contained an allotment for up to a 4% cost of living increase. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee had discussed the cost of living adjustment and was recommending a 2.5% increase for the KGIS staff. Mr. Lutz explained that they arrived

at this figure by taking an average of what the City, County, and KUB had received and rounding it to the nearest half of a percent. (County - 0; City - 3%; KUB - 4%)

Mr. Kessel commented that the County was not giving a raise. He also stated that the Policy Board should include in the motion that in the future it would be policy to set the KGIS cost of living increase based on an average of the City, County, and KUB increase.

A motion was made to approve a 2.5% cost of living pay raise for this fiscal year and the policy of the Board in future years would be for an average of the pay raise given by the three entities which make up the Board. Mr. Kessel approved the motion and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of the motion.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Kessel informed those present that he had met with Tom Key, the Sheriff, and several County Executives and Sheriffs from other counties surrounding Knoxville. Mr. Kessel stated that in this meeting he suggested that these counties send people over to look at the GIS and E-911 systems. He explained that the County was investigating buying a microwave tower for E-911 and it did not make sense to build a expensive, larger tower on the edge of the County if they could build a cheaper less expensive one and put only one disk or antennae on it. He further explained commented that as you add more wind related pieces of equipment to a tower you need a stronger more expensive tower. Mr. Kessel stated that they had made an overture to Blount, Sevier, and Anderson County and they seem to be interested in a cooperative effort to build a tower strong enough to hold several pieces of equipment and receive better radio coverage. For instance, KUB could add a disk on the tower. Mr. Kessel stated that eventually he would like to see KUB a part of the E-911 dispatch system because automobile accidents, etc. often involve down power lines or broken fire plugs. Mr. Kessel stated that these people seemed interested and he was supposed to get back with them in August.

He also mentioned that he did interject the GIS because he told them if they would share the expenses in building the tower they could use the GIS system and central dispatch. He stated that the GIS could contract with them and could bill back to them once they were on the system. Mr. Kessel stated that some of these counties were in the GIS system because KUB was in their particular area.

Mr. David Reece commented that the GIS did need to be careful in offering maps in these areas because the areas outside of Knox County are not as detailed as the areas in Knox County.

Mr. Kessel commented that he was aware of the difference and he had told the representatives from these areas that the maps were not as detailed as the ones in Knox County. For instance, the topography consists of 20 foot contours instead of 5 foot contours as in the County. Mr. Kessel stated that he mentioned this so if



anyone was contacted by representatives from these counties they would be aware of what they were interested in. Mr. Kessel stated a regional mapping and dispatch system was important.

Mayor Ashe mentioned that the next Policy Board Meeting would be Monday, September 9, at 8:30. He asked if anyone had conflicts with this meeting. There were no conflicts.

#### **FINANCIAL REPORT**

Ms. Hamilton stated that there were comments made last year that the Policy Board would like to have a fixed asset listing so the amounts could be recorded on the statements and be subject to audit. This listing would also show the true values of the GIS system. Ms. Hamilton stated that she had been working with John Lutz on going through the records to try and get a full listing of equipment so the Finance Department could match the equipment and see how much of the original purchases the GIS still has on hand.

Mr. Hoskins asked if this listing would include depreciation. Ms. Hamilton commented that the listing would include all information including depreciation. She added that luckily the GIS did not go back too far and she felt that all the necessary records were still available.

Ms. Hamilton explained that in closing out the year end there was a cash deficit in the operating fund even though the GIS went into the year with a \$118,000.00 fund balance. She explained that the deficit was due to the method of billing users after the fact at the end of the quarter. This means that the full amount of the reserves are not available for investment. Ms. Hamilton stated that the Technical Committee needs to discuss and review some alternative methods of billing. Ms. Hamilton stated that they hoped to get a Technical Committee meeting together within the next month to solve this problem. Mr. Kessel commented that he thought we were billing ahead based on a guesstimate amount and then correcting it.

Mr. Lutz answered that initially the GIS had billed ahead, but after the first year switched to a monthly billing method. Mr. Lutz further explained that after the first year the GIS had a balance in the operating fund so that balance was used to operate on for the quarter and then actual expenses were billed back to the users. Ms. Hamilton stated that now this balance is not enough to carry through the entire quarter. Ms. Hamilton further stated that the other contributing factor to the deficit is the non-GIS maintenance. Ms. Hamilton stated that the GIS receives invoices for non-GIS maintenance and pays them before billing the users. Ms. Hamilton stated that it was a combination of the two billing methods that was causing the cash deficit problem and the Technical Committee does hope to resolve this problem soon.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, November 11, 1991 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.



## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

September 9, 1991 at 8:30 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; and Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville. Arriving late, Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Jim Moore, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. Jim York, City Finance; Ms. Patsy Miller, Knox County Executive's Office; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of July 3, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

Mr. Lutz explained that at the last policy board meeting a motion was made to extend the current maintenance contract with Intergraph until October 1, 1991. He further stated that the Technical Committee was still working to reduce maintenance costs and at the present time had not negotiated a new contract. Mr. Lutz stated that their goal was still to negotiate a new contract by October 1. Mr. Lutz said that he planned to write each of the policy board members a letter to take a written vote on the new maintenance contract sometime before October 1. Mr. Lutz explained the reason for the delay is Intergraph does not separate hardware maintenance from software maintenance and it has been difficult to determine software maintenance costs. Mr. Lutz reported that since the last meeting the Technical Committee had been able to reduce the current contract by \$458.00 a month. This resulted in a \$200.00 a month

savings to some of the users. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee had made some headway but would like the rest of the month of September to continue their progress. He added that he did not need a vote at this time; he was only giving a status report. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee would report back to members of the Policy Board sometime within the month of September. Mr. Lutz commented that he hoped there would be a new contract for the remainder of the year by October 1, and if not it would be necessary to extend the current contract for another month.

#### **COST ALLOCATION**

Mr. Lutz stated that this was a status report on cost allocation. He explained that at the last Technical Committee meeting it had been resolved to develop a cost allocation plan. Mr. Lutz stated that he hoped that this plan could be implemented next July. This means that there should be a cost allocation formula for the purposes of budgeting sometime in January. Mr. Lutz stressed the importance of making a commitment now to bring about cost allocation beginning in July, 1992. Mr. Hoskins asked if the Committee was still working on developing a cost allocation formula. Mr. Lutz commented the Committee was still working on developing a formula, but several factors had caused a delay. One key factor being the rapid change in technology. Mr. Lutz explained that the committee had been close to implementing cost allocation until technology moved toward the workstation and away from the mainframe. He again stated that the Technical Committee was still working on developing a cost allocation formula and hoped to have it available in January.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz stated that he needed to give a status report on two important items as well as discuss some additional business.

ITEM 1 - The Property Assessor's Office is nearly finished adding 5000 new parcels. This numbers represents new parcels added since the property maps were sent to the conversion vendor in 1988. Mr. Lutz stated that the County had grown from 135,000 to 140,000 parcels in a three year time period. Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS Department hopes to have the associated database loaded by the end of October which would include property appraisal information and owner information.

ITEM 2 - The Metropolitan Planning Commission has projected that their addressing project would be completed by November of 1992 if the present rate of work is maintained. Mr. Lutz stated that depending on the area progress slows or accelerates. He added that this date was subject to change.

Mr. Lutz stated that at the previous Policy Board meeting the committee had approved a motion for the GIS Department to go out for bid to surplus some equipment. The equipment being the MicroVax 250 and Interact 32C workstation. The bid received on the MicroVax was \$1,350.00 which was exactly 1% of the original purchase price. The Technical Committee considered this offer and decided to keep it since it is still used for development work. Mr. Lutz explained that they had dropped maintenance on the 250 to a per call basis so it is not costing anything to maintain. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee did recommend keeping the MicroVax 250. The other item was the InterAct 32C workstation which the GIS was offered \$2,156.00. Mr. Lutz stated that the workstation was offered to GIS users at this price and there were about 10 interested parties. Mr. Lutz explained that the names of the interested parties were put in a hat and the Knox County Highway Department won the first choice to purchase the workstation at \$2,156.00. Mr. Lutz stated that he did need approval from the Policy Board to sell the workstation at the price of \$2,156.00 and to keep the MicroVax 250.

Mr. Hoskins made the motion to sell the InterAct 32C to the Knox County Highway Department for \$2,156.00 and to keep the MicroVax 250. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Lutz stated that the next item of business was one that had been touched on at previous meetings. The Technical Committee felt they needed some direction in deciding whether to charge non-profit organizations for maps or map products. Mr. Lutz stated that he was turning the discussion over to David Reece from KUB because he was more familiar with the issue.

Mr. Reece stated that KUB's position had always been to support economic development by supporting the Chamber of Commerce and other such agencies. Mr. Reece stated that KUB had supplied the Chamber with maps and other items over the years. Mr. Reece stated that he thought the agreement concerning GIS products was to charge anybody outside of the three participating parties. Mr. Reece stated that the Technical Committee would like to have an agreement or motion from the Policy Board concerning this issue. He proposed that each of the three participating agencies could supply maps and records for economic development at the discretion of their own managers without charging back to the GIS for these products. Mr. Reece added that he thought this would be more in line with their normal mode of operation. Mr. Reece again asked that the Policy Board reach an agreement concerning this issue.

Mr. Kessel asked for further explanation. David Reece explained that if for instance there was an area of town that the Chamber was actively trying to promote for economic development they might call KUB and ask for a map showing facilities available in that particular area. Mayor Ashe asked if there had been a charge for this in the past. Mr. Reece answered that no there had not been a charge because up until now the process had been manual. Mayor

Ashe asked if the request was to waive any charges for maps relating to economic development. Mr. Reece clarified his request by stating that it should be at the discretion of the managers at each of the three participating parties whether to charge for GIS products used for economic development.

Mr. Kessel stated that the danger would be that anybody could say that they knew someone at a particular agency and try to get the products free. Mayor Ashe asked what kind of charges were being discussed. David Reece commented that at the present time charges are small. Mayor Ashe asked for specific prices. Mr. Lutz commented that they were approximately \$50 - \$75 per map sheet. Mr. Lutz stated that if someone from the Chamber of Commerce went to the Metropolitan Planning Commission to request a paper map it would be produced and the charge would be \$53.00. Mr. Lutz explained that MPC reimburses the GIS \$20.00 of the \$53.00 received per map sheet. Mr. Lutz stated that City Engineering had been following the same guidelines for pricing as MPC, but he was not sure how they handled requests from non-profit organizations and organizations using the maps to promote economic development.

Mr. Sam Parnell commented that City Engineering charged for all requests unless there was an agreement with another agency to swap maps. Mr. Parnell said, for example, City Engineering had swapped GIS maps for maps belonging to the Tennessee Department of Transportation. Mayor Ashe asked David Reece if KUB had any requests of this nature recently. David Reece answered that yes KUB had received requests recently. Mayor Ashe asked him if KUB had charged for the products. Mr. Reece commented that no KUB had not charged in the recent past and that is why he was asking for some guidelines as to how to treat non-profit agencies and agencies requesting products to use for economic development.

Mr. Kessel commented that he thought there should be a minimum charge to cover labor expenses. Mr. Kessel further commented that he did not have a problem in giving the information on the system or system time to help promote economic development, but he did have a problem in making it free. He stated that he thought there would be people who would request maps and map products because they were free, whereas if there was a minimum charge this might not happen. Mr. Lutz agreed because he explained that sometimes it is hard to determine whether a map is for the agency or a private individual doing work for that particular agency.

Mr. Kessel asked Mr. Lutz what he did when individuals from City or County Offices requested a map. Mr. Lutz answered that usually he sends them to MPC or City Engineering where they are charged for maps. Mr. Kessel asked Mr. Jim Moore, MPC, if they usually charged the full amount for these type requests. Mr. Moore answered no that they usually drop the \$20.00 that is reimbursed the GIS because those people represent agencies that are already paying for the GIS. Mr. Kessel commented that he thought there should be a minimum charge to keep people from abusing the system. Mr. Hoskins asked if \$20.00 would be a reasonable charge. Mr. Lutz said that



\$20.00 would probably be an adequate charge to keep people from abusing the system. Mr. Kessel stated that if there was a minimum charge all requests should be channeled through MPC or City Engineering.

Mr. Reece commented that at the present time all KUB information is not available to MPC or City Engineering so they could not handle all requests.

Mr. Kessel stated that no matter who handled the request the minimum charge should be consistent with every department. Mayor Ashe commented that City Engineering had a problem at one time deciding who to charge and who not to charge so they decided to charge everyone.

David Reece stated that at the present time KUB is not handling walk-in requests but they have had special requests. Mr. Kessel stated that when the GIS first started Mr. Lutz had requests from people in development and they were sent to MPC to get maps. Mr. Kessel further stated that there were some who came to his office complaining about the price of maps and he asked them what they would have paid if they did the work themselves. The amount was much more than the price that MPC was charging. Mr. Kessel added that it was important to be consistent in the minimum amount charged.

Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. Lutz what would be a reasonable amount to charge these agencies for map products. Mr. Lutz answered that \$20.00 was the current charge to the GIS per map sheet made in MPC. Mr. Lutz stated that he thought Sam Parnell added this \$20.00 charge to the price of City Engineering's maps although they did reimburse the GIS for this amount because they are in the City and they reimburse it in the Operating Expenses. Mr. Lutz said that he would propose that KUB charge a minimum amount of \$20.00 and that amount would stay at KUB. Mr. Kessel again stated that the important thing would be to stay consistent in charging.

Mr. Lutz stated that there was another issue to consider which is treating agencies differentially in regards to where public information is concerned. Mr. Lutz stated there needed to be some further research done concerning this matter. For instance, there is another non-profit agency that called him, Hallsdale-Powell Utility District, and wants 36 map sheets. Mr. Lutz asked what the GIS should charge them. Mayor Ashe stated that they should pay the same price as everyone else. Mr. Lutz stated that he had planned on treating them like anyone else who walked in requesting map sheets.

Mayor Ashe asked if payment was made in advance. Mr. Lutz answered that he thought MPC billed for some maps. Mr. Jim Moore answered that they ask for a check when the maps are picked up. Mayor Ashe stated that he thought it should be a simultaneous exchange. Jim Moore explained that it is rare for them to bill anyone.

Mr. Kessel made a motion that there should be a \$20.00 minimum charge per map sheet to governmental entities. Mr. Kessel added that the individual departments would have to use judgement to decide how to charge for multiple copies of the same map or for projects that required more or less time than the usual. The motion was amended to provide for a minimum charge to non-governmental agencies and that payment for any request should be received at the time distribution is made. The minimum charge being \$53.00 per map sheet as of September 9, 1991 to non-governmental agencies. The motion was seconded and all members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Kessel added that Mr. Lutz might want to meet with the utilities again and tell them about the benefits of the system. Mr. Lutz stated that he had talked with some of the utilities as well as with the University of Tennessee.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of adjournment.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Friday, November 15, 1991 at 2:00 p.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

November 15, 1991 at 2:00 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; and Hon. Victor Ashe, Chairman, Mayor City of Knoxville; and Hon. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive.

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Sue Adams, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. Dick Moran, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Bob Bowers, Metropolitan Planning Commissioner; Ms. Betty Bean, Knoxville Journal.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Victor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of September 9, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

Mr. Lutz reported that the maintenance contract was signed and is effective through June, 1992. Mr. Lutz stated that this contract reflects a savings of \$12,400.00 compared with last year's contract. Mr. Lutz added that the Technical Committee will continue working to reduce the maintenance costs for the coming year. Mr. Lutz asked if there were any questions concerning the maintenance contract and there were none.

## PHOTO STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Lutz stated there have been some problems with the photo update project. Mr. Lutz reported that Mid States Engineering (MSE) had been selected in January by bid process to do the aerial photography and conversion for this year's update. He further reported that MSE had flown the photography and sent the photo indexes along with the contact prints to the GIS in May. The photo indexes were unacceptable and were sent back to MSE for review. The GIS received a redelivery of the indexes and contract prints in August. Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS sent MSE additional information in August, and a month later he called MSE to verify receipt of the information. At this time he was told that Bob Williams, who had been in charge of the project, was no longer employed at MSE. He was told that someone would get back to him, and let him know who would be in charge of the project. Mr. Lutz stated that he was later contacted by Steve Wood who had been assigned to the project. Mr. Wood told him that he would get back with him when he had assessed the project status. The GIS recently received the first two deliveries of the test model. Mr. Lutz explained that the project is behind schedule, and MSE has informed him that they can not do a reasonable amount of map sheets until May. Mr. Lutz stated that this is a problem which he feels the GIS can not live with at this late a date.

Mr. Hoskins asked if there was a penalty clause in the contract. Mr. Lutz answered that there were no penalties, but the contract could be terminated. Mr. Lutz added that he had talked to an attorney in the County Law Department who advised that the contract could be terminated based on the facts indicated for cause, and the GIS would only owe MSE for the work they had completed.

Mr. Kessel asked if the GIS should be responsible for the work that was unsatisfactory. Mr. Lutz stated that the work that was unsatisfactory had been redone. He added that it did take them two months to redo the photo indexes. Mr. Lutz stated he had planned for this contract to be different than the previous update contract in that the photography would have been flown in March and the maps updated by November. Unfortunately, MSE has yet to put any serious effort forth. Mr. Lutz stated that he sent MSE a letter on October 15 inquiring when the first pilot sheets might be delivered and informing them he was prepared to recommend that the contract be terminated unless they could show some serious effort. Mr. Lutz stated that they did respond by sending two deliveries.

Mr. Lutz asked Mr. David Reece of KUB if he had any comments or additions concerning the MSE contract. Mr. Reece stated that about four months had been lost on the project and there are still technical issues to be resolved which should have been worked out early on. Mr. Reece stated that he was not sure how to proceed on this matter, but stated that the project is running behind the original schedule. Mr. Lutz stated that he was aware of the technical difficulties that would be encountered when the contract was signed. He added that Bob Williams was here at the contract



signing, and that he had mentioned the complicated technicalities to him. At this time, Mr. Williams acknowledged the technical issues and stated it would be fine they could work through them when the project was underway. As Mr. Lutz said earlier, Mr. Williams is no longer an MSE employee. Mr. Lutz stated that the project is now in the technical stages, unfortunately, time is running out.

Mr. Lutz reported that he had been investigating the possibility of getting another vendor to do the conversion. He added that in any case he recommended rebidding the contract for next year's update. Mr. Lutz stated that whether or not this contract is completed with MSE is a matter that needs to be determined.

Mr. Hoskins asked if shifting the contract over to another vendor was an option. Mr. Lutz stated that he was not sure at this time, but is awaiting a recommendation from the Law Department. Mr. Lutz explained that the option he had discussed with the Law Department involved asking the next lowest bidder if they would accept the contract at their previous bid price. Mr. Lutz again stated that he was awaiting a recommendation from the Law Department.

Mr. Lutz stated that not knowing which purchasing guidelines the GIS was under the City, County, or KUB complicated the matter. Mr. Kessel stated he assumed the GIS was under Knox County's Purchasing procedures since the GIS was a mutually operated County department. He added that this matter was decided in the early stages of operation. Mr. Kessel asked David Reece if he had looked at this problem. Mr. Reece answered yes that he had reviewed the documents sent to him by Mr. Lutz explaining the problems with MSE. He stated that after reviewing the documents, he feels that the GIS could discuss the technical issues with MSE or they could go back to Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., who were the next lowest bidder, to do the project. Mr. Reece stated that he was on the fence about the issue.

Mr. Kessel stated if the problem was deemed an emergency the GIS could approach the next lowest bidder. He added that the County had done this in the past and it would not be a problem as long as there was reasonable cause.

Mr. Lutz again stated that he did advise rebidding the contract for the coming year instead of renewing with MSE. Mr. Hoskins asked if the GIS did choose to stay with MSE was there any evidence that they could do a reasonable amount of sheets in the time stated. Mr. Lutz answered that there is not evidence they could provide sufficient results by May. Mr. Reece asked Mr. Lutz if he had informed MSE that the May completion date was not an acceptable time frame. Mr. Lutz answered that he did express to them that May was far longer than he had planned for the project. Mr. Kessel asked if MSE had actually completed the aerial photography. Mr. Lutz answered yes they had completed the photography and had received payment for this service. Mr. Reece explained that the breakdown occurred in the conversion process where the photographs

are converted to digital data. Mr. Reece stated that this breakdown occurred because the original project manager, Bob Williams, apparently left in a hurry. Mr. Lutz added that this period of four months was dead time for the GIS on the update project and MSE was responsible for the delay.

Mr. Kessel asked if the company was reliable. Mr. Lutz and Mr. Reece both answered that MSE had a good track record. Mr. Reece stated that KUB had used them twice on conversion projects and they had done an excellent job. Mr. Reece added that technically they were competent. He mentioned there was one area that their technical competence was tested and he stated that he was not aware of the results. Mr. Lutz answered that they had proven their skill in this particular area which was updating the digital terrain model (DTM) and topography.

Mr. Sam Parnell asked if MSE intended on completing the project in May. Mr. Lutz answered that they intend to complete 50 sheets by May. Mr. Lutz added that he originally hoped to have 100 sheets updated. Mr. Kessel stated that it sounded like the GIS needed to go with another vendor to complete the project.

Mr. Hoskins suggested that the Technical Committee be given the authority to expeditiously decide whether to terminate the contract with MSE. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee had discussed it once and that they would meet again to make a decision. Mr. Reece stated that when MSE was given an ultimatum they did produce some results which the GIS staff felt were good products.

Mr. Kessel made a motion to give the Technical Committee the authority to take whatever measures necessary, including the option to rebid, to get the update project completed. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. Mayor Ashe asked if there were any questions or comments and there were none. All members voted in the affirmative regarding the motion.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Lutz stated that there were two items to be discussed under other business.

**ITEM #1** - The University of Tennessee has decided they would like to become a Level II participant in the GIS. Mr. Lutz explained that according to the formula adopted by the Policy Board for Level II participants this means that U.T. would have to pay an annual license fee of \$2,758.00 with a \$758.00 a year minimum usage charge. Mr. Lutz explained that this interest in the GIS caught him by surprise. He had talked with U.T. as well as other agencies about the GIS and at the time was told the money was not available. Mr. Lutz stated that a representative from U.T. called him and said the money was available where was the contract. He stated that he looked back at the minutes from the Policy Board meeting and at the

time the formula was adopted the decision was made to write a contract when there was a need for one. Mayor Ashe asked if there was a problem and Mr. Lutz answered that there was no problem it was actually good news. Mr. Lutz stated what he needed was permission by the Policy Board to hire an attorney from Plangraphics, Inc. who is familiar in developing these types of contracts to write a Level II participant contract for the GIS.

Mayor Ashe asked about Plangraphics. Mr. Lutz explained that this was a company that the GIS worked with initially during the early planning stages. Mayor Ashe asked where they were located and Mr. Lutz answered that they were located in Frankfort, Kentucky. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz if there were any attorneys in Knoxville with these expertise. Mr. Lutz answered probably not as reasonably priced as Plangraphics. Mr. Lutz explained that Plangraphics' expertise was in GIS matters and the attorney, Hugh Archer, has written similar contracts of this nature for other counties so it would not require as much research. Mr. Lutz stated that Hugh Archer said it would cost less than \$2,000.00 to draw up the contract and this sounded like a reasonable amount. Mayor Ashe asked if \$2,000.00 would have to be spent every time someone became a Level II participant. Mr. Lutz answered no that it would be a generic contract that could be modified. Mr. Kessel added that the business of public information is an extremely careful subject and Plangraphics is extremely knowledgeable on these issues and in the past has been helpful. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz if he had investigated the possibility of there being an attorney in Knoxville with these abilities. Mr. Lutz answered that no he had not because it was doubtful that there would be any. Mayor Ashe suggested that Mr. Lutz ask KUB who they used as an attorney. Mayor Ashe stated that he felt that the GIS should look first in Knoxville and Knox County before hiring an outside firm. Mr. Kessel stated that it was not likely to find someone with these expertise in Knox County. Mayor Ashe asked that Mr. Lutz first look inside Knox County before selecting Plangraphics. Mayor Ashe suggested that Mr. Lutz contact the Policy Board members by phone concerning this matter so that he would not be held up until the next Policy Board meeting. Mr. Lutz asked where he might inquire as to the availability of these persons. Mayor Ashe suggested that he contact the Knoxville Bar Association. Mr. Kessel suggested that he check with KUB.

Mr. Hoskins asked Mr. Reece if they had an attorney who handled contracts of this nature. Mr. Reece commented that not in this particular area, however, their original contract was written by Dennis Ragsdale. Mr. Reece stated that he was not sure where Mr. Ragsdale was at this time but he thought he may be in practice by himself. Mr. Lutz said that he would check with the Bar Association as well as inquire about Mr. Ragsdale. Mayor Ashe suggested that he also talk with Richard Beeler, Judge Workman, and Tom Varlan. Mayor Ashe asked that Mr. Lutz report back to the Policy Board members concerning this issue in a couple of weeks.



ITEM #2 - The next item under other business is Addressing. Mr. Lutz stated that he had asked Ms. Sue Adams of the Metropolitan Planning Commission if she would like to be present for this discussion. Mr. Lutz stated that he would like to report his findings concerning addressing and he mentioned that Ms. Adams might have something to add to his statement. Mr. Lutz reported that he along with some others had been looking the past four weeks at methods which could be used to shorten the amount of time required to obtain a clean GIS address database. He further stated that their findings were, that the present process and the present rate of progress may never result in a clean address database. Mr. Lutz added that there are a lot of changes going on and the process is too slow. He stated that never was probably not a correct word, but that it would be a long time before there was a completed product. Mr. Lutz further explained that this was at the existing rate. Mr. Lutz stated that the next question was could more people be added to produce a finished product in a shorter amount of time. The answer was no the process is the problem. Ms. Adams stated that they had a better idea now.

Mr. Lutz stated that he and several others met with a person from Digital Mapping in Kentucky who already has an address database for Knox County which he claims to be 98.5% matched to all the addresses in which mail is delivered. Mr. Lutz stated that this man has cleaned his database by driving streets and verifying addresses. He has sold a similar type database to the Knoxville News Sentinel. Mr. Lutz reported that this man, Don Surbeck, came to Knoxville the day before and he and some others met with him regarding this database. Mr. Lutz stated that Mr. Surbeck said he could have a clean GIS address database 98.5% accurate in six months for \$110,000.00. Mr. Lutz commented that this was far sooner and far less costly than any of the alternatives entertained. Mr. Lutz went on to say that this was an informational type report and that he did not need any action from the Policy Board. Mr. Kessel stated that it seemed action was needed concerning this issue. Mr. Lutz stated that no he did not need a recommendation because there were other things to consider, and he did not think it was appropriate for the GIS to fund the addressing project. He stated that this was a matter for the Policy Board to determine, but he was not even sure the GIS would have the money. Mr. Kessel mentioned that E-911 depended heavily on correct addresses as did other agencies within the County. Mr. Lutz stated that this database had been checked against other sources such as E-911, South Central Bell, U.S. Post Office, etc. Mr. Lutz added that this is an incredible database given it is what Mr. Surbeck says it is. Mr. Drew Lancaster of KUB stated that this man had come to him asking for GIS addresses. Mr. Lutz reported that he had sent his staff over to the Knoxville News Sentinel to see what they had, and the Sentinel was not really willing to cooperate because they had been advised by an attorney that if they give the information to the GIS it becomes public information. Mr. Lutz stated that if things work out there may be a recommendation to this Board or perhaps the City and County independent of the GIS to fund an effort to get the GIS address database up-to-date.



Mr. Lutz asked Ms. Adams and Mr. Bowers if they had anything to add to his comments. Ms. Adams commented that she along with Mr. Lutz's staff and also John McCook had spent some time with Mr. Surbeck to determine if his database would solve the addressing problems. Ms. Adams stated that they were convinced that this would help with the addressing problem. She stated that there would still be problems with duplicate street names and confusion about the correct name of some streets that would have to be worked out. She added that there did not seem to be any doubt as to whether it could meet John McCook's need for address ranges within a time frame that is workable. She commented that this was without the technical people spending a great deal of time with Mr. Surbeck. She stated that they believed the address database could be attached to the GIS file which is one of the costly and time consuming steps that MPC has not had the technology to deal with and that Mr. Surbeck apparently has. She stated that he has done this in other cities and has developed algorithms, parsing formulas, and other software and programming products which MPC has not been able to do. Mr. Kessel asked what was going to be done. Ms. Adams stated that if everything works out she hopes Mr. Lutz will recommend using the database. Mayor Ashe asked Mr. Lutz if he needed action by the Policy Board and Mr. Lutz stated that no he did not. Mr. Lutz added that there has been no discussion as to funding for this project.

Mayor Ashe asked if there was anything else to be brought before the GIS Board and Mr. Lutz answered no.

Mr. Hoskins asked where this issue is going from here. Ms. Adams stated that Mr. Surbeck has been asked to submit a proposal. Mr. Lutz stated that his staff would continue to investigate the possibility of using Mr. Surbeck's database.

Mayor Ashe asked if there was anything else to be brought before the GIS Board and there was nothing.

Mr. Kessel moved the meeting adjourn and Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of adjourning.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, January 13, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

January 13, 1992 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Chairman, Knox County Executive; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering (representing Mayor Victor Ashe).

**STAFF PRESENT;** Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Dick Moran, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Ruble, MPC; Mr. Jeff Welch, MPC; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Director, County Finance; and Mr. John Lutz, Director, Geographic Information System.

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sam Parnell, representing Mayor Victor Ashe, called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order. It was at this time that Mr. Hoskins mentioned that the chairmanship should rotate at the first of the year. Mr. Hoskins then made a motion to rotate the chairmanship to Mr. Kessel for the 1992 year following rotation order. (County-KUB-City) Mr. Sam Parnell seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Parnell then turned the meeting over to Mr. Kessel.

### PHOTO STATUS UPDATE

Mr. John Lutz stated that the first item on the agenda was the status report of the photo update contract. Mr. Lutz stated that at the last meeting there was discussion concerning the problems with the photo update contract which had been awarded to Mid States Engineering (MSE). Mr. Lutz explained that during the last meeting the Policy Board members gave the Technical Committee authority to determine the fate of the current contract including terminating the contract if necessary. Mr. John Lutz reported that subsequent to the last Policy Board meeting there had been some discussion with MSE, and a mutual decision to terminate the contract resulted. Mr. Lutz further explained that the Technical Committee had given MSE some deadlines regarding the updates, and MSE felt they could not meet these deadlines. Consequently, a mutual agreement to terminate the contract was reached.

Mr. Kessel asked where MSE was located. Mr. Lutz answered that they were located in Indianapolis and added that they were a reputable firm. He explained that the company recently experienced some internal problems which resulted in the delays on the KGIS project. Mr. Lutz reported that after terminating the contract with MSE, the contract was then awarded to the next lowest bidder. Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., was the next lowest bid, and they agreed to complete the project at the price that was bid in their previous proposal. Mr. Lutz reported that Baker is currently working on the updates, and the KGIS is currently in the process of finalizing a contract with them. Mr. Lutz further stated that the contract had been detained in Baker's attorney's office and that Baker had decided to continue working without a finalized contract. Mr. Lutz added that this project should be completed by March.

Mr. Lutz reported that a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued for the next aerial photo updates. Mr. Lutz explained that the last contract had an extension option for up to three years, but since the vendor was unable to perform the Technical Committee felt that the KGIS should request new proposals for the next updates. Mr. Lutz added that the proposals are due in by January 22, 1992. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee would have to report back to the Policy Board before the next meeting for a recommended vendor for the new contract.

Mr. Lutz asked if anyone had any questions or comments concerning the photo update contract. Mr. Sam Parnell commented that he recalled that the previous vendor, MSE, was going to complete the project sometime in the spring. Mr. Lutz explained that MSE had stated that they could finish 50 map sheets in the spring and Baker had indicated, without knowledge of MSE's time frame, that they could finish more map sheets by the end of March. Mr. Lutz stated that the last time he talked with Baker they were still on schedule, and thought they had the necessary materials from MSE to complete the project. Mr. Lutz further stated that Baker's deadline was two months sooner than what MSE had promised for half the amount of work.

Mr. Lutz added that he hoped the new contract could be awarded and finished by September, 1992. Mr. Lutz further stated that he hopes to get the photography flown in the spring each year and the conversion completed by September of each year.

Mr. Kessel asked how the updates were being accomplished. Mr. Lutz explained that the updates are done one year at a time. Mr. Lutz asked Mr. Kessel if he was asking about the updates or the contract for the updates. Mr. Kessel asked about the contract. Mr. Lutz explained that the contract was for a year with the option to renew for up to three years. Mr. Lutz further explained that the vendor provides in their proposal the basis for their escalator fee if the KGIS should choose to renew for another year. Mr. Lutz commented that the contract with MSE would have been renewable for up to three years if they had performed adequately. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee intends to issue a request for proposal every three or four years instead of every year. Mr. Kessel commented that the Policy Board members should be kept informed as to the status of the update contracts every year. Mr. Kessel recommended that the status of the contract be discussed at a certain meeting each year and put on the agenda. Mr.

Lutz agreed and added that he had hoped to bring the contract to this meeting for approval, but as he explained earlier the contract has been detained in the attorney's office. Mr. Lutz again stated that Baker agreed to proceed with the work since they are the reason for the delay on finalizing the contract. Mr. Lutz added that he hoped to have the finalized contract available for the Policy Board's approval before the next Policy Board meeting on March 9.

Mr. David Reece commented that it is possible that MSE could be awarded another contract with KGIS. Mr. Reece added that there were no problems with MSE's technical competence and the reason for their delays was a result of internal problems which could be alleviated. Mr. Lutz stated that MSE had been sent an RFP for this next update. Mr. Lutz added that the termination of the contract was by mutual agreement, and was not because MSE was technically incompetent. There being no further discussion concerning the update contract Mr. Lutz moved to the next item on the agenda.

## ADDRESSING

Mr. Lutz stated that the next item was a status report on addressing. Mr. Lutz reported that at the last meeting there was some discussion on the possibility of contracting with a third party to do some work on addressing. Mr. Lutz added that the KGIS continued to pursue this matter, and had talked with a potential vendor about aligning the GIS address database to match the Post Office database. Mr. Lutz stated that Keith Stump, KGIS Database Manager, prepared an addressing request for proposal which has been reviewed by MPC. Mr. Lutz stated that the RFP was in its final stages and should be mailed to potential vendors soon. Mr. Lutz explained that it had been established that the RFP would be issued by MPC, and MPC would be the contracting officer. Mr. Lutz added that the KGIS would be providing technical support in entering the products into the system.

Mr. Lutz asked Drew Lancaster, KUB, Information Services, if he had received a copy of the RFP. Mr. Lancaster had not and Mr. Lutz told him that there should be one in the mail.

Mr. Lutz stated that he had a meeting planned with the Director's of the City and County Finance Departments to discuss possible methods of funding the work. Mr. Lutz stated that the progression of the project hinges on being able to find funding. Mr. Lutz added that assuming the funding falls into place they hope to have a contractor selected by mid February. Mr. Lutz stated that one potential contractor had indicated that it would take him 6 months to complete the project. Mr. Lutz stated that this would mean the project would be completed by the end of July. Mr. Lutz added that done internally, it would take several more years to have an address database in place. Mr. Lutz stated that the goal would be to get a standardized address database in place for everyone to use. Mr. Lutz stressed the importance of having one standardized address database instead of each department maintaining their own separate database. Mr. Lutz stated



that the best way to begin accomplishing this goal would be to standardize to what the Post Office uses and then add to that database instead of building one from the current records.

Mr. Hoskins asked if the Post Office would be involved in this process. Mr. Lutz stated that the Post Office does offer their list of addresses for comparison to the proposed new database. Mr. Lutz stated that one potential vendor does accept address lists from other sources to match against their own list to locate potential problems. Mr. Lutz added that this particular contractor would not add addresses which were not found in the KGIS database. Mr. Hoskins asked why they would not add the ones that do not exist. Mr. Lutz commented that he was not sure, but he thought it was probably to keep people from building their own databases.

Mr. Kessel suggested that one of the Policy Board members talk with the Postmaster about getting additions to the address database. Mr. Lutz stated that the particular vendor they talked with indicated that his performance criteria was 98.5% matched with the Post Office addresses. Mr. Lutz stated that this man had worked with the Post Office, and had built the database for the Knoxville News Sentinel. Mr. Lutz commented that he hoped this vendor would bid on the addressing project.

Mr. Drew Lancaster asked if this potential vendor would be supplying addresses for the houses. Mr. Lutz answered that yes the addresses would be to the houses, and that this particular vendor also supplies the latitude and longitude of the addresses.

Mr. Kessel asked if when building a database such as this what is considered the primary element the address or the names. Mr. Lutz asked if Mr. Kessel if he was referring to street names. Mr. Kessel answered no he was not referring to street names and explained that where there are six or seven apartments what name would be used for the address if the apartment was vacant. Mr. Kessel asked Mr. Reece how KUB handled these cases. Mr. Reece commented that the postal database maintains names for addresses. Mr. Lutz explained that the KGIS system contains addresses even if the address is vacant, but it does not contain the names of the people who live at addresses. Mr. Hoskins added that it would be a tremendous job to keep names updated. Mr. Lutz stated that the goal of the KGIS is to have every valid address on the system, and to be able to locate addresses geographically. Mr. Kessel commented that there would also be cases where a single house with one address is converted into apartments with four addresses. Mr. Kessel added that it would almost be necessary to spot check to alleviate problems such as these.

Mr. Lutz stated that one potential contractor has been out in the field extensively in Knox County, and feels he has a pretty good feel for the problems which may arise. Mr. Lutz added that there would also be problems with commercial shopping centers and how they are addressed. Mr. Lutz stated that this particular contractor has indicated that he can handle these problems with several options. Mr. Kessel asked how a wipe-out is handled. For instance when an old apartment building is demolished and a commercial building is built. Mr. Kessel asked how long it would take for this situation

to be detected. Mr. Lutz answered that this was a good question and he was not sure if this situation would even be detected with the current system. Mr. Lutz added that with valid addresses in the system the ability to track building permits will be available. Mr. Lutz added that he thought the City Codes Department was prepared to track building permits by address, and this would mean when a building permit was issued to demolish a structure it would be detected immediately.

Mr. Kessel asked if four houses existed on a block and three of them were demolished and the property was zoned commercial what would happen to the three addresses. Mr. Lutz commented that since there were no standards this situation might be handled differently each time it occurs. Mr. Kessel added there should be some policy explaining what to do in these situations so it is not handled differently each time. Mr. Lutz added that policies are easy to develop for new streets that do not have any addresses on them, but it is much more difficult to decide what to do to an older street which has already been assigned incorrect addresses. Mr. Lutz thought that the current policy for new streets was one address allowed for every 25 feet of road frontage.

Mr. Kessel commented that in some towns they use a breakdown of an address for example 101-A, 101-B, etc. This method would allow for multiple addresses if they were located in one building. Mr. Kessel stated that hopefully in the future there would be a policy in place to address these problems. Mr. Kessel added that if everyone agreed to these policies once they were in place it would be easier to enforce them. Mr. Lutz commented that there are ordinances in place in both the City and County to enforce addressing policies in the future, but they do not fix problems which have already occurred. Mr. Lutz stated that there are a lot of problems that MPC is aware of and there is a lot of work to be done subsequent to adding the new database. Mr. Lutz stated that there would be a need for modifications such as changing street names to remove duplicates. Mr. Lutz added that he hoped with new policies in place it would prevent duplicates. Mr. Lutz asked if there were any questions concerning addressing and there were none. Mr. Lutz then moved to the next item on the agenda.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

At this time it was brought to the attention of the Policy Board that the minutes from the previous meeting had not been approved. The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of November 15, 1991 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz reported that the Cost Allocation Committee is still working on a cost allocation formula which will allow for a usage based formula to be used next year. Mr. Lutz stated that he had a meeting the next day with the Cost Allocation Committee and

their goal was to have a usage based formula for budget purposes in January. Mr. Lutz stated that it may not be the final formula but would be close enough to estimate for budget purposes. Mr. Lutz stated that Beth Bowman, KUB, had been very helpful in working with the formulas. Mr. Lutz added that he thought they were very close to having a formula to divide the costs up fairly. Mr. David Reece and Ms. Kathy Hamilton agreed with Mr. Lutz.

Mr. Kessel asked where they actually stood on dividing the costs. Mr. Lutz answered that they had a formula that addresses all the costs. Mr. Lutz added that the cost of the bonds had been removed from the formula since the City, County, and KUB had agreed to pay back the bonds by dividing the costs equally. Mr. Lutz further explained that operating costs, aerial photography sinking fund, and the equipment sinking fund were included in the formula. Mr. Lutz explained that some of the costs would be divided based on how much area a particular entity covered. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee felt that some of the costs were not directly based on CPU time and they would be charged based on the amount of area covered. Mr. Kessel asked if this would apply to Farragut or other outside entities. Mr. Lutz stated that yes this would apply to Farragut and other such agencies. Mr. Lutz commented that he thought Farragut had contracted with a firm in Oak Ridge to develop their own mapping system. Mr. Lutz added that he suspected they had other projects preventing them from joining the GIS.

## FINANCIAL REPORT

Mr. Lutz stated that the last item on the agenda was the financial report and Mr. Lutz asked Ms. Kathy Hamilton, County Finance Director, to give that report.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the Finance office was working on a form of report that could be sent out the Policy Board. Ms. Hamilton added that there had been a change in the format of the financial information sent to Mr. Lutz. Ms. Hamilton explained that since amounts had been appropriated out of the aerial photography and equipment reserve funds and probably would be appropriated annually the Finance Office changed from showing these amounts accumulating to showing each amount separately in the revenue account and the expenditure account by itself. Ms. Hamilton stated that this allows Mr. Lutz to compare his operating revenue and expenditures and capital revenue and expenditures. Ms. Hamilton stated that currently it looked as though about \$2,000.00 more had been spent than has been received in revenue. She stated that this is pretty even for the first six months of the year. Ms. Hamilton stated that the Finance Department plans to make more changes concerning equipment. She added that they were trying to get an actual list of equipment located in-house.

Mr. David Reece asked for the balance in the Aerial Photography Reserve account. Ms. Hamilton stated that she did not bring the balance sheet account with her, but that quite a bit of the funds in this account had been appropriated. Ms. Hamilton added that in fact the appropriation was setup so that if the KGIS spends what has been appropriated

the account would be about dead even by the end of the year. Ms. Hamilton commented that the feeling was that this money needed to be spent. Ms. Hamilton added that there has not been much spent to date. Ms. Hamilton went on to explain that coming into the year there was a little over \$257,000.00 in the reserve fund and about \$94,000.00 has been spent year-to-date.

Mr. Lutz explained that the \$94,000.00 was for completing the previous contract with Baker and some work that MSE completed under the last contract. Mr. Lutz added that the appropriated funds would have been spent if the contract with MSE had been completed. Mr. Lutz added that he thought that \$217,000.00 had been appropriated out of the Equipment Reserve Fund and very little of that has been spent. Ms. Hamilton added that she thought about \$18,500.00 had been spent from Equipment Reserve. Ms. Hamilton stated that the Equipment Reserve Fund balance was approximately \$400,000.00. Ms. Hamilton added that about \$40,000.00 to \$45,000.00 had been appropriated from this account and that would leave a balance of \$350,000.00 or more. Mr. Lutz commented that he could get that exact figure. Ms. Hamilton commented that the Equipment Reserve was still building it was only the Aerial Photography Reserve Fund which had been appropriated.

Mr. Kessel asked how KUB was coming along on the GIS. Mr. Reece replied that KUB is in the process of updating some of their maps. Mr. Reece added that the Water Bureau has a contract with MSE for conversion of their maps and records. Mr. Lutz added that the Electric and Gas Bureaus were adding quite a bit of new equipment including workstations. Mr. Lutz commented that KUB is in the process of purchasing a gateway to connect the KGIS VAX to their IBM computer. Mr. Lutz explained that this gateway will allow KUB to retrieve data on an Intergraph workstation from the IBM machine. Mr. Lutz stated that this will allow KUB to look at transformers and other information available on the IBM computer without having to interface with two systems.

Mr. Reece added that at the present time everything is going real well and the status of the GIS was where he thought it should be. Mr. Reece commented that KUB, Gas had completed conversion and the use of the GIS is a routine function at the Electric Bureau.

Mr. Lutz stated that Sam Parnell would have to comment on the status of the GIS in City Engineering. Mr. Parnell commented that City Engineering has converted all their ward maps, official city maps, to the GIS system. Mr. Kessel again stressed the importance of having one standardized official set of addressing maps.

Mr. Lutz commented on the status of the GIS in the Property Assessor's Office. Mr. Lutz stated that the Assessor's Office has completed property maps on the GIS and are currently up-to-date. They are now inputting deeds for this year. Mr. Kessel asked about the status of the reappraisal system. Mr. Lutz explained that the Property Assessor's GIS Department would interface with the new appraisal system. Mr. Lutz explained that during the initial conversion a two years backlog of new parcels and subdivisions occurred. Mr. Lutz added that the Property Assessor's Office completed



the two year backlog and is currently entering this years information as it occurs. Mr. Lutz added that the Property Assessor's Office is still maintaining both the manual and automated mapping systems. Mr. Lutz added that hopefully 1991 was the last year to maintain both systems. Mr. Lutz stated that this year would probably be the first year that all mapping is done on an automated basis.

Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS has been working with the company that sold the Property Assessor their new reappraisal system. Mr. Lutz stated that this system would be interfaced with the GIS Intergraph system. Mr. Lutz added that the Property Assessor's software vendor is actually working with Intergraph to interface their software.

Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS has also worked with the E-911 people as they request proposals on the new emergency dispatch system. Mr. Lutz stated E-911 had indicated that they wanted a graphics map interface. Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS has talked with several potential vendors about the dispatch system interfacing with the GIS.

Mr. Lutz stated that in planning the GIS everyone involved thought the system would be in place overnight, but it has taken more time than originally planned. Mr. Kessel stated that the important factor was that the GIS had been making progress. Mr. Reece added that he thought the GIS was on track with the original plans it was only taking longer. Mr. Kessel stated that he hoped everything was being done correctly so that it would not have to be done again. Mr. Reece and Mr. Lutz both answered that they thought everything was being done accurately. Mr. Lutz commented that the biggest problem has been the rapid changes in computer technology.

Mr. Kessel asked if there were any more questions or comments and there were none. Mr. Kessel announced that the next meeting would be Monday, March 9, at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Sam Parnell seconded the motion. All members were in favor of adjourning.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, March 9, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

March 9, 1992 at 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. David Reece, KUB, (representing Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Chairman, Knox County Executive; Mr. Sam Parnell, Director, City Engineering (representing Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville).

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Dick Moran, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Ruble, MPC; Ms. Kathy Ayres, MPC; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, County Finance; Ms. Patsy Miller, Knox County Executive's Office; and Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System.

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Kessel called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of January 13, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. At this time Mr. Kessel commented that the minutes were quite lengthy and asked if the minutes could be paraphrased in short paragraphs. Mr. Kessel added that recorded tapes of the meetings could be kept for one year. Mr. Reece added that Mr. Hoskins had commented on the length of the minutes also. Mr. Sam Parnell made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. David Reece seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative. Mr. Parnell made a motion to paraphrase the minutes and keep the tapes for one year. Mr. Reece seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

### PHOTO STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Lutz stated that the KGIS Department issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) in December to select a contractor for the aerial photo updates. Mr. Lutz stated that after review of the proposals the Technical Committee recommends Michael Baker, Jr., for the update project. Mr. Lutz asked that the Policy Board award the contract for this year and an optional three additional years to Michael Baker Jr., Inc. Mr. Lutz added that the Technical Committee has discussed qualifying three vendors to do updates so that in any given year the KGIS Department would have 3 options for updates.

Mr. Reece made a motion to allow John Lutz to work with County Purchasing on a limited source for update projects. Mr. Kessel stated that this motion also includes awarding the update contract to Michael Baker, Jr., Incorporated. Mr. Kessel added that if Purchasing needed verification of the limited sources on the update project the Policy Board members would provide a letter. Mr. Sam Parnell seconded the motion to allow Mr. Lutz to work with the Purchasing Department on the update project and to approve Baker as the new contractor for the 1992 update project with an optional extension for up to three years. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

A discussion about the area to be updated in 1992 followed. Mr. Lutz showed the proposed update area on a map and explained the reason for choosing the East section of Knox County. Mr. Reece made a motion to approve the proposed area in the East section of Knox County. Mr. Sam Parnell seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

### **ADDRESSING UPDATE**

Mr. Lutz reported that funding for the addressing project had been resolved. Mr. Lutz explained that City Council and County Commission each appropriated \$37,500.00 for hiring a contractor for the addressing project. Mr. Lutz added that the Knox County School System contributed \$23,000.00 and the Metropolitan Planning Commission contributed \$35,000.00 toward funding for the project. Mr. Lutz reported that Digital Mapping, Incorporated located in Louisville, Kentucky has been chosen as the contractor. Mr. Lutz explained what Digital Mapping, Inc. would be providing under the terms of the contract. Mr. Lutz stated that Digital Mapping has scheduled completion of the project by July, 1992. Mr. Lutz added that there would be additional work required to scrub the data and clean up other databases.

There was some discussion concerning the need to change street names due to duplications. The need to change road signs was also discussed.

### **COST ALLOCATION FORMULA**

Mr. Lutz explained that the Cost Allocation Committee had devised a complicated formula for dividing costs (Cost Allocation Formula handout on file in KGIS Department). Mr. Lutz emphasized that this is a preliminary formula and should be used for budget planning only. He added that the Committee felt that this formula was close to what would be used for cost allocation.

Mr. Sam Parnell made a motion to approve the preliminary cost allocation formula for budget purposes. Mr. Reece seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

## LICENSING

Mr. Lutz reported that the University of Tennessee was interested in purchasing digital information for 10 map sheets. Mr. Lutz stated that he had received a letter of intent from Betsey Creekmore, Associate Vice Chancellor at U.T., stating that the University is interested in connecting to the GIS. Mr. Lutz stated that U.T. has been given the digital files requested based on their letter of intent to become a member of the system. Mr. Lutz added that the letter also states that if U.T. decides not to join the system they will pay \$10,000.00 for the 10 map sheets. There was some discussion regarding the draft of the licensing agreement (License Agreement on file in KGIS Department).

Mr. Lutz discussed the details concerning the pricing of digital files. Mr. Lutz explained that the Technical Committee recommended that the cost of each digital file be \$300.00 per theme (i.e. planimetric, topographic, and property). Therefore making the total cost of obtaining all the information for one map sheet \$900.00. Mr. Lutz explained that the files will not be sold but licensed to the interested party. The license agreement would be effective for one year and at the end of the year would have to be renewed for a fee of \$5.00 per map sheet. Anyone with an up-to-date license could purchase an updated version of the file (when available) for \$140.00. Mr. Lutz explained that the renewal provision would help to control unauthorized copying and use of data.

Mr. Reece made a motion to accept the recommended pricing for digital files. Mr. Parnell seconded the motion. All members voted in favor of the motion.

## OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Lutz stated that due to the condition of the plotter the KGIS Department issued a request for bids for a new plotter. Mr. Lutz stated that the KGIS Department received two bids and is currently evaluating them to determine the lowest price including maintenance, software drivers, etc.

Mr. Reece made a motion to allow the Technical Committee to review the bids and decide between Versatec's bid of \$39,825.00 and Intergraph's bid of 43,928.00. Mr. Sam Parnell seconded the motion. Mr. Lutz added that the money was available in this year's budget. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in favor of the motion.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion Mr. Reece moved that the meeting adjourn. Mr. Parnell seconded the motion. All members voted to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, May 11, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.



## MINUTES

# REVISED

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

May 11, 1992

City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. David Reece, KUB, (representing Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, County Finance, (representing Hon. Dwight Kessel, Chairman, Knox County Executive; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; **Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering;** Mr. Dick Moran, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. John Ruble, MPC; Ms. Kathy Ayres, MPC; Ms. Patsy Miller, Knox County Executive's Office; and Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System.

#### CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hamilton called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of March 9, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes and Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

#### KGIS BUDGET

Ms. Hamilton stated that there were two items which changed after Mr. Lutz initially submitted the budget. The first item the contract services amount should include the contract amount for the audit of the GIS Department. Ms. Hamilton stated that this item had always been included with Knox County's audit and this has been the first year that the auditors bid the audit of the GIS Department separately. Ms. Hamilton stated that Knox County would bear the cost of the audit for the 1991-92 fiscal year since the proposal was received late in the year. Ms. Hamilton stated that the cost of the audit would be \$5,000.00 for this year and next year. Ms. Hamilton requested that the budget amount for FY '93 contract services be amended to include the \$2,500.00 charge for the GIS audit for FY '93 this would change the line item of contract services from \$24,184.50 to \$26,685.00.

Ms. Hamilton stated that a second amendment would be required to increase the amount budgeted for office space for FY '93. Ms. Hamilton explained that the preliminary figure was based on last year's cost of office space which was \$9.59 per square foot. Ms. Hamilton stated that Mike Edwards of the Public Building Authority furnished her with the new rate per square foot which is \$10.22. This would change the line item for office space in the FY '93 budget from \$11,055.00 to \$11,773.00.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the third item concerned Fringe Benefits. Ms. Hamilton explained that the County recommends that the car allowance under Fringe Benefits be revised to be an average of the amount of the City and County car allowance. Ms. Hamilton added that KUB employees are given cars instead of an allowance. This would require amending the car allowance figure from \$5,832.00 to \$4,596.00 changing the Fringe Benefits total to \$48,720.00. Mr. Reece asked if the car allowance, being part of the compensation for the Director, should be approved separate from the budget. There was some discussion concerning this question.

Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the budget with Fringe Benefits not included. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

There was some discussion concerning the budget amounts for merit and COLA increases.

Ms. Hamilton asked that the previous motion concerning the approval of the budget be amended to include the increase in the Contract Services line item to include the GIS audit and the increase in the amount set aside for office space. Ms. Hamilton also added to the amendment that these amounts be deducted from the remaining fund balance so that it would not affect the budget set in the City and KUB. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion including the additional amendments. All members voted in the affirmative.

There was some discussion concerning Fringe Benefits. There was some discussion concerning the parking allowance for the GIS Director. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the Fringe Benefits portion of the budget (42,873.92) based on 21% of the total amount budgeted for salaries and including \$4,596.00 for the Director's car allowance and a parking allowance of 180.00 which is an average of the City and County parking allowance. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion and all members voted in the affirmative.

Ms. Hamilton summarized the revisions made to the budget bringing the revised total to \$1,992,068.00.

Mr. David Reece asked about the capital outlay budget. Mr. Lutz summarized the capital outlay budget (attached).

Mr. Lutz asked Mr. Ruble to provide a status report concerning the Addressing Project. Mr. Ruble stated that Mr. Don Surbeck would be delivering a pilot phase that afternoon and this would indicate whether the information would be useful. Mr. Ruble commented that the information received thus far had proved useful. Mr. Ruble

indicated that it would be necessary to evaluate the pilot deliveries to determine the success of the project. Mr. Ruble did comment that the MPC has planned a meeting to form a committee of interested parties to discuss additional problems with addressing.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion or additional comments Ms. Hamilton moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded and all members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, July 6, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

July 6, 1992

City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Chairman, Knox County Executive; Mr. Jim York representing Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Ruble, MPC; Mr. David Reece, KUB, Information Services; and Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System.

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Kessel called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of May 11, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. York seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

### COST ALLOCATION

Mr. Lutz reported that the Cost Allocation Committee, consisting of representatives from the City, County and KUB, had worked out a formula for allocating costs to KGIS participants based on usage.

Mr. Lutz recognized those who participated in designing the cost allocation formula. Mr. Lutz then explained the factors involved in arriving at the formula (see Attachment) and asked if there were any questions. There was some discussion regarding the specifics of the formula. There was some additional discussion concerning the formula in regard to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

At this time Mr. Kessel asked about the status of the Addressing Project. Mr. John Ruble reported that the contractor, Digital Mapping, Incorporated, has been cooperative but has been slower than what was expected. Mr. Ruble stated that the information received so far seems to be of good quality and the projected completion date of July 1 has been extended to the end of August.



Mr. Ruble added that a Addressing Committee has been reestablished with representatives from outside agencies to help solve some of the addressing problems. Mr. Ruble commented that the MPC staff has been learning more about the dilemma of changing addresses/street names. Mr. Ruble added that the MPC hopes to meet with the City and County officials to explain the need for changing certain street names or addresses.

Mr. Lutz explained in more detail the method of billing participants for their usage based on the cost allocation formula. Mr. Lutz asked again if there were any questions or comments and there were none.

Mr. Lutz asked the Policy Board to approve the cost allocation formula. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the proposed cost allocation formula and Mr. York seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Lutz then submitted revised copies of the FY '93 Budget which was approved at the previous Policy Board meeting for information purposes only.

#### **COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT**

There was discussion about the cost of living adjustment (COLA) for the KGIS staff. Mr. Kessel requested that an amendment be made to include the COLA increase in the KGIS budget. Mr. Lutz stated that the current method of figuring COLA increase for the KGIS staff was to take an average of the City, County, and KUB increase. Mr. Kessel stated that he felt that this method would not always be appropriate and requested that it be reviewed each year as an amendment to the budget.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion to set the FY '93 cost of living adjustment for the KGIS staff using the average of the City, County, and KUB COLA increase. (City - 3%; County - 4%; KUB - 3.25%) Mr. York seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote and all members voted in the affirmative.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion or additional comments Mr. York moved that the meeting adjourn. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, September 14, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

September 14, 1992

City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Hon. Dwight Kessel, Chairman, Knox County Executive; Mr. Joe May representing Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Jeff Welch, MPC; Mr. David Reece, KUB, Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB, Information Services; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; and Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System.

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hoskins called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of July 6, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. May seconded the motion. All members voted in the affirmative.

### LICENSE AGREEMENT

Mr. Lutz reported that the University of Tennessee has expressed an interest in becoming a member of the GIS. Mr. Lutz stated that a license agreement had been developed and a rough draft was sent to U.T. representatives for review. Mr. Lutz added that U.T. representatives have expressed an interest in using the GIS in their physical plant operations as well as academics. Mr. Lutz stated that the rough draft of the license agreement had been reviewed by U.T. representatives and sent back to the GIS with recommended modifications. Mr. Lutz explained that questions had arisen in the Technical Committee as to whether the U.T. academic community should be allowed to physically connect to the system. Mr. Lutz explained that this would be a large drain on system resources as well as pose some potential security problems. Mr. Lutz added that there was some question as to whether the amount of money they would be charged as a participant would be enough to allow them information beyond the U.T. area. Mr. Lutz explained that the annual charge for U.T. to use the system would be a minimum of \$2,750.00 based on the current usage based formula. Mr. Lutz stated that

the first question was would the GIS be generous enough to allow U.T. to use the system for academic purposes at no additional cost. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee felt that it would be in the best interest of the GIS to not allow the academic department to physically connect to the system because of the drain on system resources and potential security problems. Mr. Lutz said that it would be possible to give U.T. a copy of the partial database to use for academic purposes. Mr. Lutz asked for the guidance of the Policy Board regarding this matter. There was some discussion concerning this issue. Mr. Hoskins suggested that this license agreement be limited to the physical plant only until further study of the proposed relationship with the academic department could be completed. Mr. Lutz agreed that this might be the best way to approach the problem at the present time until more information could be gathered concerning the academic department and their use of the GIS. Mr. Lutz stated that he would continue to work with the academic department to provide a way for them to benefit from the GIS.

### ADDRESSING UPDATE

Mr. Jeff Welch, Metropolitan Planning Commission, reported that the addressing project which is currently being done by Don Surbeck of Digital Mapping in Louisville, Kentucky is running behind the original schedule. Mr. Welch added that there has been deliveries of the Phase I & II Pilot areas which had data which was excellent in some areas and lacking in others. Mr. Welch stated that confidence was not real high on the total project being completed with the accuracy indicated in the agreement. Mr. Welch added that the some of the data seemed satisfactory but overall had not lived up to expectations. Mr. Welch stated that there had been some communication problems as well as problems with the data which had hopefully been worked out. Mr. Welch stated that the MPC is currently waiting for a redelivery of the Pilot for Phase I and II of the project and would reevaluate the situation after this redelivery. There was some additional discussion concerning the addressing project. Mr. Welch asked if there were any questions or comments and there were none.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion or additional comments Mr. Kessel moved that the meeting adjourn. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, November 9, 1992 at 8:30 a.m., City County Building, Room 549.

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

November 9, 1992 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. E. C. Hoskins, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Ms. Patsy Miller, County Executive Representative.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. John Ruble, MPC; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB, Information Services; Mr. David Reece, KUB, Information Services; Mr. Larry Fleming, KUB.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Hoskins called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of September 14, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Hoskins made a motion to approve the minutes. Seconded and approved.

### **LICENSE AGREEMENT**

Mr. Lutz discussed ongoing efforts with the University of Tennessee to bring them in as a participant of the system. Concerns about letting UT have direct access have been addressed and direct access will be allowed only by one office for the purpose of downloading files.

Mayor Ashe asked if this would satisfy the University's needs. Mr. Lutz explained that for the academic planning and physical plant functions it would satisfy their needs because it is more than they have now.

Mayor Ashe asked who Mr. Lutz has been working with at UT. Mr. Lutz stated that Mr. John Shearer and Ms. Betsy Creekmore are in charge of planning and have been the contacts at UT.



## **FRAMME SOFTWARE**

Mr. Lutz stated that GIS is looking at converting land records management to Framme Software like KUB electric, gas and water use. GIS has a proposal they are looking now and by the next meeting should have a decision whether to go with the conversion or seek another avenue with Intergraph.

## **ADDRESSING UPDATE**

Mr. Lutz brought up the addressing project under contract since March 1992 with Digital Mapping in Louisville, Kentucky, who is to provide an addressing database.

Mr. Ruble reported that we have contracted with Mr. Surbeck of Digital Mapping who has been trying to get the address database updated to make it more complete. Mr. Ruble indicated there have been some problems and delays, but he has delivered Phase I and it is in pretty good shape.

Mr. Lutz stated that there are things that Mr. Surbeck will not be able to provide. One is speed limits on each road segment which are critical for routing, and directional information. The money Mr. Surbeck has been paid is worth what he produced for us. Mr. Ruble said the pilot was \$11,700.00 with the total payment for Phase I being less than \$40,000.00. If he provides the rest per specifications, he will receive the remainder.

There was discussion concerning the reasons only one bid was received. Some responses Mr. Lutz received from non-bidders (such as Mid-States and Baker) were that they felt it would be an extensive project and they could not do it for the \$130,000.00 being offered.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Ashe moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion and mentioned that this was his last meeting and that Mr. Larry Fleming would be replacing him as General Manager of KUB. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, January 11, 1993, 8:30 a.m., City-County Building, Room 549.

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

January 13, 1993 1:30 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Jeff Welch, MPC; Mr. Norman Whitaker, MPC; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. Richard Moran, Automated Systems

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Ashe called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of November 11, 1992 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Fleming made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mayor Ashe. Approved.

### **CHANGE OF CHAIRMANSHIP**

Mayor Ashe made a motion that Mr. Larry A. Fleming be nominated as the new Chairman of the Policy Board. No further nominations were made. Seconded and approved.

### **LONG RANGE PLAN REPORT**

Mr. Lutz discussed changes that will be taking place over the next several years with the GIS system. Intergraph no longer provides support for any of their software on a VAX platform or even sells VAX equipment. Choices are to go with another vendor or migrate to one of Intergraph's newer platforms. Intergraph is going to a Windows format which will allow for more users at a lower cost. There is a possibility of receiving trade-in credit for the existing software since it does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The new software allows you to build your own applications while the current LAN based software is self-contained and un-modifiable.

Intergraph has agreed to work with GIS on a migration plan that will carry through the prototype stage to the pilot project stage at no cost since the existing software does not meet requirements. (There will be a hardware cost once in the pilot project stage.) Full implementation is estimated for 4th quarter of 1993. The technical committee has discussed this project and they feel that the implementation will be the 4th quarter of 1994. No fiscal impact until the following budget year.

Mr. Lutz stated that the only problem that is foreseen is that KUB has just completed conversion to the present system and it is not a good idea for them to switch at this point.

### **ADDRESSING UPDATE**

Mr. Whitaker has been in contact with Mr. Surbeck of Digital Mapping regarding the possible default of contract to provide Phase I and II of the addressing database. Phase I (the address range) is on the system. The Phase II pilot is being checked. Mr. Surbeck is receiving reduced payment for Phase I (80% of contract amount) and the same approach will be taken for Phase II payment. There are some critical deadlines with the school board for Phase II.

### **LICENSE AGREEMENT**

Mr. Lutz reported Mr. John Shearer from UT returned their contract January 12, 1993, and they are ready and anxious to sign once some minor changes are made. Mr. Lutz asked if there were any objections to passing the final contract around to be signed by the committee members prior to the next meeting so that UT can begin using the contracted services. Mr. Kessel made a motion to allow the committee to decide and sign. Seconded by Mr. Fleming. Approved.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz stated he received a call from the Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration who is building a database of all state owned property. They provided map numbers for CLT maps and property maps that they own property on and want either plots of these or preferably electronic files for those maps. Discussion followed regarding cost to State, should they provide the information as requested, and problems that may arise. Mr. Kessel made a motion that the files be provided at cost as for other agencies and individuals. Seconded and approved.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Ashe moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Fleming seconded the motion. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Friday, March 12, 1993, 8:30 a.m., City-County Building, Room 549

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

March 12, 1993 8:30 p.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Ms. Kathy Ayres, MPC; Mr. Norman Whitaker, MPC; Mr. Jim York, City Finance; Mr. Richard Moran, Automated Systems

### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Larry Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of January 13, 1993 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. Fleming. Approved.

### BUDGET PRESENTATION

Mr. Lutz handed out an amended copy of the KGIS Budget for 93-94. (Change in maintenance area where \$2000 has been added for equipment that was left off the original list of maintenance charges from Intergraph.) Change in this year's budget over last year's is in the area of aerial photography - from \$100,000 to \$150,000. This year we will be updating an area that has not been updated since 1985 - the western most part of Knox County. This amount allows us to update the entire county every four years. We are looking at some other methods that may result in a decrease in the cost of updating.

Mr. Lutz stated that areas to update are prioritized by checking with other agencies to see where the most changes have been made. Cost is based on the number of map sheets and the area photographed. The University of Tennessee will also be picking up a percentage of the aerial photography cost once their contract has been finalized. The town of Farragut has indicated that they are interested and will be spending about \$7500 a year if they decide to participate. Lenoir



City Utility Board is also interested. Mayor Ashe stated that allowing Lenoir City to participate needs to be discussed by the Policy Board at future meeting.

Mr. Lutz pointed out that he has also budgeted a continuation of the person funded for half a year this year - the amount to include a 3% increase for cost of living.

Mr. Fleming asked why the principal and interest amounts had decreased on the budget comparison sheet. Mr. Lutz stated that there are only two more payments left on the P & I, next year will also decrease about \$50,000.

Mr. Fleming asked when equipment reserve figures will be available. Mr. Lutz stated he would probably have that information in two weeks from county finance, with the increase supporting whatever capital program we have.

Mr. Fleming asked where the maintenance expense amounts come from. Mr. Kessel asked if rates were negotiated with Intergraph. Mr. Lutz stated that maintenance expense is the contracted amount from Intergraph. Mr. York stated that these rates are set by Intergraph and are only on the common equipment. Mr. Lutz pointed out that each department has their own maintenance expenses that they are billed for by the GIS department after GIS receives invoices from Intergraph. Cost estimates are provided each department based on past year's charges.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

No new business.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kessel moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mayor Ashe seconded the motion. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, May 17, 1993, 8:30 a.m., City-County Building, Room 549

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

May 17, 1993 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Richard Beeler, County Law Director; Ms. Kathy Ayres, MPC; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, County Finance; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Dick Moran, Automated Systems; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Jeff Welch, MPC

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of March 12, 1993 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Kessel made a motion that the minutes be approved, second by Mr. Fleming. Approved.

### **CAPITAL BUDGET PRESENTATION**

Ms. Hamilton handed out summaries of the reserve fund balances for June 30, 1992, with estimates for June 30, 1993. Mr. Lutz stated that the funds for Capital Outlay requests come out of reserve funds, and are not requests for money over and above the budget reviewed at the last meeting. Mr. Lutz estimates that at the end of 1992-93 fiscal year there will be approximately \$110,000.00 left in the aerial photography reserve. \$150,000.00 has been requested for 93-94 to do updates, which is the amount of expected revenues for the year. This amount may need to be increased at a later date after determining which map sheets need to be updated. The increase will come from the \$110,000.00 in reserve and any such request would be brought before the Policy Board at a later date. The contract with Baker provides the unit costs for various services. The budgeted amount is derived using unit cost for the various services and estimating how much of each service will be required. The more changes that need to be made to a map sheet the more it costs to update it.

Regarding equipment purchase, Mr. Lutz stated that the GIS has been working on a long-range plan with Intergraph for migration to a client/server environment. This will require the purchase of new equipment and software at some future point. The base amount of

\$30,000.00 in the Capital Outlay budget will provide for replacement of a few pieces of existing equipment and upkeep of some not on maintenance. The KGIS would like to start moving to the client/server platform some time this year, which will require additional funding and Policy Board approval of that funding. Future requests will also be out of the reserve fund and will not exceed the amount in the fund. Mr. Lutz stated that he would like to request \$30,000.00 at this time and come back to the Policy Board at a later time to request additional funding for the new platform. Mr. Fleming stated that he did not see any problems with this at this time. Mr. Kessel asked what affect the Intergraph lay-offs would have on this long-range plan. Mr. Lutz stated that Intergraph's prices would probably become more competitive. Intergraph might also be asking KGIS to do some consulting work.

Mr. Fleming asked for a clarification of the aerial reserve money. Ms. Hamilton stated that monies left from the previous fiscal year are placed in reserve funding and not listed as part of the new budgeted amount. The funds are available but in reserve. Mr. Lutz would have to come before the Policy Board in order to request monies from the reserve fund. Mr. Reece stated that the costs of updating the West Knox area will exceed the \$150,000.00 budgeted for the next year and that some of the \$110,000.00 that is in the reserve from 92-93 would need to be used.

Mr. Kessel asked if it was necessary to keep such a high amount in equipment. Mr. Lutz answered that this amount will not replace the existing equipment under the old technology but would be a base from which to begin. The rapid changes in the computer industry do not allow for us to put a definite figure on equipment costs. Mr. Fleming asked how much is being put into equipment reserve this year. Mr. Lutz stated that the tri-party agreement states that "12% per year of the initial cost of basic hardware in service" be placed in equipment replacement. This year that came out to \$155,587.00. It is a smaller amount this year because a plotter that cost \$100,000.00 was replaced with a plotter that cost \$40,000.00. It is on a formula basis, not including software.

Mr. Kessel made a motion that the Capital Outlay budget be approved. Mr. Ashe seconded the motion. Approved.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Lutz reminded members of the Policy Board that the contract amendment with Baker needs to be signed with the new negotiated rates. In January of 1992 an RFP for aerial photography and map update services was issued. Responders were to provide formulas for cost adjustment for a four-year period. Baker was selected as the best and most economic proposal. This year's contracted amounts are finished and the contract needs to be renewed at the 1993 rates, which are within the proposed cost adjustment. Mr. Lutz asked for a motion to accept the contract with the new rates. Mr. Kessel asked what kind of money he was talking about. Mr. Lutz responded that it depended on what services they were asked to provide. The KGIS is in control of the amount by the services requested. The cost would be within the Capital Budget request. This year's contract is within the range Baker provided in their RFP. Mr. Ashe asked how long Baker has been doing the updates and why we don't do a RFP each year. Mr. Lutz stated that this was the second year with Baker - Mid-States was used for one year, Woolpert for a year, and Baker at one other time, and that it placed an undo work load on the GIS staff to have

to do an annual RFP. Mr. Ashe asked how often Mr. Lutz felt one should be done. Mr. Lutz stated that every three years or so would be adequate unless some cheaper and easier means of updating became available. Mr. Kessel asked if any other GIS departments had been contacted to see how their aerial photography and updates were contracted and priced.

Mr. Ashe stated that in the future Mr. Lutz should place all items for discussion on the agenda as he was not aware this item was to be discussed and was not prepared to discuss it. Mr. Lutz said that in the future he would try to include all items for discussion as requested. Mr. Fleming stated that he requested the contract be brought for discussion because there was need of clarification regarding the signing of documents for the Policy Board. He asked if the contract needed to be signed before the next meeting. Mr. Kessel stated that the next meeting was not until July. Mr. Lutz reminded the Policy Board that the contract needed to be signed before July because it would cause a delay in the update process.

Mr. Kessel made a motion that the contract be approved for another year and that other GIS departments be contacted for comparison of vendors/suppliers. Mr. Fleming seconded the motion with a note to have other items placed on the agenda for future Policy Board meetings. All voted in the affirmative with a noted exception of Mr. Ashe who abstained for lack of information.

As an item of information, Mr. Lutz stated that the KGIS is continuing talks with Farragut First Utility regarding their becoming participants in the GIS. He will be asking the Technical Committee to begin reviewing new user categories which need to be formulated to be more responsive to the needs the community has. Users no longer need to connect directly to the GIS computers - some have their own systems, and more in line with technology changes. It is easier to make a copy of the data and allow them to use it locally. Hopefully at the next Policy Board meeting new rates and suggestions will be available for the Policy Board to adopt.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kessel made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Fleming seconded the motion. All members agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Thursday, June 17, 1993, 8:30 a.m., City-County Building, Room 549



## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

June 17, 1993 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dick Moran, Automated Systems, representing County Executive Dwight Kessel

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order. Recognized Mr. Moran as representing Mr. Kessel.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of May 17, 1993 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Moran made a motion the minutes be approved, second by Mr. Fleming. Approved

### **KGIS BUDGET**

Mr. Lutz stated that the budget to be discussed was the same budget presented at the March 12, 1993 Policy Board Meeting, which reflects a reduction of \$460,000.00 from the current year's budget. The budget assumes a 3% COLA, which is not a definite number yet as the County and KUB have not finalized their COLA's. Mr. Moran made a motion to approve the budget as written, second by Mr. Fleming. Approved

Mr. Lutz asked for a motion to base the KGIS COLA on the average of the City, County and KUB (listed on the budget as 3%) making any changes to the COLA after the County and KUB finalize their budgets. Mr. Fleming made a motion to continue the Policy Board's past practice of averaging the COLA's of the City, County and KUB, and that the computation of such be provided to the Policy Board Members with at least a days notice. No response from the Policy Board Members would constitute approval. Mr. Ashe seconded. Approved

### **NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Ashe asked that the next meeting be changed to Friday, September 17, 1993 due to a prior commitment. Confirmation will be made with Mr. Kessel before a definite date is established.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Ashe made a motion the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Fleming seconded. All members agreed to adjourn.

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

September 17, 1993 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Kathy Ayres, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. Jim York, City Finance

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of June 17, 1993 were brought to the floor for approval. Mayor Ashe made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. Kessel. Approved

### **GRIFFITH ARCHER SURVEY RESULTS**

Mr. Lutz stated that Griffith Archer was the consulting firm hired by the County to develop new job descriptions compatible with ADA laws and to develop salary ranges and position classifications. The results of the survey were discussed at the last Technical Committee Meeting (on September 14) and some changes are going to have to be made. These changes will be brought before the Policy Board at the November meeting for approval.

Mr. Fleming asked how many job descriptions and salary ranges there were and Mr. Lutz stated that at present there are five different classifications, but under the plan recommended by Griffith Archer these would be reduced to four.

### **MIGRATION**

Mr. Lutz handed out a tentative migration schedule and outline. The problem we are having is the current software on the GIS system is Land Records Management (LRM) software which the city and county use to do their business. The majority of usage by the city and county is LRM. Intergraph terminated LRM

as a product in 1989 and made no further modifications. Another problem is that the mainframe platform is out of production and no longer supported by Intergraph and we can no longer buy any enhancements to that system. Another part of the problem which makes the solution more difficult is that KUB's software performs very well on the existing system and they are not interested in moving to a different platform. This complicates the city and county move to a different platform as we share data and moving one person to a different platform makes it more difficult to share data.

We have been working with Intergraph since 1989, since they terminated enhancement to LRM, to come up with some method for us to exist without the LRM. We have explored several options with them such as: getting the software from them and making enhancements to it ourselves; rewriting our applications in the software that KUB is using; moving to a product which Intergraph currently supports to do the LRM functions - a product called MGE; moving to a different software vendor.

In January 1992, Intergraph agreed that they would help us work on a five-year migration plan to move us over to the MGE platform. They presented the results of the plan in March and outlined three steps to go through. Step one is a prototype where they are going to take basically what we're doing on the system now - maintaining land records in the city and the county and show us how that would work on the new software. They demonstrated this prototype in August 1993. The next step is the pilot project where we would actually buy hardware and software and they would provide some application software on a trial basis. We would pay someone to do some consulting with us and basically work out the kinks of how we were to maintain data on two computer systems and keep the same functionality at KUB that we have today but enhance that for the city and the county. The third phase is full implementation. What Mr. Lutz has done here is outline the solution and what the constraints of the solution are and developed a preliminary schedule with target dates for completion. At the November meeting of the Policy Board Mr. Lutz would like to present a contract and budget figures for purchasing some new hardware and software, scope of work for consultants to assist us in the process and present that for approval. Soon after that we would begin work on the prototype so that by February we could identify any hardware or software that needed to be purchased by either the city or the county to move to this new system. Hopefully this would be in time for the capital outlay budgeting in February. Mr. York stated that this would be in time for budgeting but the concern from the finance standpoint was that the GIS was still not performing the way it should be and they are not sure that this is going to solve their problems and address their needs. He asked if we were going to SQL or not. Mr. York stated that there is some concern whether the machines in finance were compatible with SQL. He understood that KUB and Mr. Parnell were happy with the present system but that other departments are not getting what they need. They want to make sure that any system meets the needs of all parties involved and are addressed in any type of migration.



Mr. Lutz stated that the existing software allows no flexibility to tailor any kind of interface to it and has proved unworkable in some areas. Mr. Fleming asked why these things were not considered six years ago during the initial planning of the system. Mr. Lutz stated that six years ago these things were considered but the options were less than they are now. The new software will be supported on PC's and the interfaces are becoming more standardized.

Mr. Fleming asked if it was normal to hire a consultant from a vendor. Mayor Ashe stated that he felt it was a conflict of interest. Mr. Lutz replied that the vendor was more familiar with the software and they were hired as consultants with the initial purchase to come in and help implement their software with our workflow. The GIS staff could have additional training or additional staff could be hired for this purpose. Mr. Reece stated that Intergraph was really providing technical assistance for our products to familiarize the staff with the product and what it actually does. Mayor Ashe wanted to know if Mr. Lutz was recommending that we employ the vendor as a consultant. Mayor Ashe still feels this is a conflict of interest. Mr. Lutz stated that other software vendors have been looked at and the results of the evaluation were that it was not desirable monetarily or functionally - it was not a realistic option. Mr. Reece stated that staying with Intergraph is the most practical option since they provide the best hardware and software for utility management and that this decision was reached six or seven years ago. Mr. Kessel said he thought there were a lot more people in the market for this. Mr. Lutz stated that there are a lot of people in the low end on the PC level and they can be included in our solution for the standalone GIS system on PC's, as more and more PC's become more and more powerful, but realistically the management of all this information of coordinating utilities and so on is not a realistic solution and choices are very limited. Mr. Reece stated that for the past three to four months Jerry Julian of the GIS staff and other GIS staff members have been looking over the various software available on a technical basis for a product that meets the needs of the city and county. At this point they are looking at having Intergraph help link the current product with the new to move to an open industry standard that would work with SQL and other interfaces. Mr. York said that at this point they are not sure SQL is going to satisfy their needs because they are not sure they are going to be able to use it. Mayor Ashe wanted to know how this problem was going to be resolved. Mr. Fleming reminded the Policy Board that these are technical issues for the Technical Committee to go over and make sure everyone feels comfortable with. The Technical Committee recommendation has to be there for whatever it is the Policy Board is asked to look at. Mr. Fleming also suggested that everyone have the opportunity to look at this a little more in advance since it is a very complex issue.

Mr. Kessel wanted to know what sort of a lifetime system was being talked about. Other consultants have provided assistance for about five years and then walked out when the product is no longer functional. Several companies are very bad about this. Mr. Lutz stated that one of the things we are trying to do is move to an open industry standard. SQL is an industry standard for accessing databases

- not an Intergraph product. One of the problems with the interface with the city is they have a one of a kind system that does not speak SQL. All we are able to provide for them right now is basically a printout. Mr. Fleming stated that the technical issues at this point do not need to be discussed and should be brought up at the next Technical Committee Meeting. Mr. Reece reminded the Policy Board that we were not looking at the end result at this point because the products are still in a state of transition. It would still be difficult for people to use the system because they would have to be computer literate. Mr. Lutz stated that this was intended to keep the Policy Board informed of the migration issue and the Technical Committee still hopes to come to a recommendation in November.

Mr. Kessel stated his concern with obsolescence. Mr. Lutz said the new software would be functional on industry standard PC's. Mr. Kessel asked why the vendor would not be interested enough in making the sale to provide the initial change over and not charge us for it. Mr. Lutz said they have actually gone through a detailed pilot project where they have come here and studied our workflows and gone back and implemented them on their software and come back and demonstrated them in our offices to us. What they see is that we are going to have to make some modifications to our data to work out some of the details in order for it to work with the new system. They feel that this should be paid for by us whether we hire them as consultants or not. When we bought the original system, we bought a lot of software we did not use. What we want to do this time is have them provide software during development and purchase only that software that we have to have. Mr. Fleming stated that these were Technical Committee issues and a recommendation should be brought to the Policy Board from them.

Mr. Lutz asked how the Policy Board felt about getting an independent consultant to look at the overall migration issue because it is going to be a long term thing. Mayor Ashe asked what they were paid and Mr. Lutz said that it was put out on bid, but was in the neighborhood of \$50,000 to \$100,000. Mayor Ashe felt this was a very large gap. Mr. Reece said this was a Technical Committee issue and they needed to talk about how it might be managed. Mayor Ashe felt it should be a consultant that does not have a conflict of interest and he would not vote for one that had a blatant conflict. He also felt that consultants had a way of escalating costs and we needed to have a way of handling this. Mr. Fleming felt the whole issue belonged with the Technical Committee.

Mr. Fleming called for other questions with respect to migration. No more questions.

## **SALES TO THIRD PARTIES**

Mr. Lutz stated that this was an informational thing and did not call for a vote. UT has become our first level two participant and has signed and executed an

agreement and we will be sending them a bill in the next few weeks.

Mr. Reece and Mr. Lutz have meet with the West Knox consortium which includes Lenoir City Utilities Board, First Utilities District, Town of Farragut, Concord Telephone, and West Knox Utility. They would like to join together and purchase our landbase to do facilities mapping and landbase mapping and would like a price to purchase it as a group of five. If we do not provide this they would have to do their own aerial photography and develop their own maps at considerable expense or use old maps from TVA or the property assessor. They would not have as good a product as we could provide. Mayor Ashe was concerned that the city, county and KUB are subsidizing the needs of the West Knox group and if so, he was opposed to it. Mr. Reece stated that was why we were trying to come up with a reasonable rate to charge them. We do not want to provide them with something that the city, county and KUB have had to foot the bill for. At this point all they have been provided are a few map sheets paid for on a contract basis. Mr. Fleming suggested some finance people get together as a pricing committee to set some prices for what they are asking. We should not have to subsidize other participants. Mayor Ashe said this is a board decision. Mr. Lutz stated that no arrangements would be made before November 8 and that the cost of the original plan is to be included in the charges that will be applied. Kathy Hamilton, Beth Bowman and Jim York were recommended as possible finance members to get together to review and see what they think a fair price is. Cost will be based on geographic size of the area. Mayor Ashe asked how eminent this was and Mr. Reece stated that they were waiting on a price from us. Mr. Kessel said that whatever is offered to them will have to be offered to others as well. Mayor Ashe said he views the Town of Farragut differently than the others because they are not a public entity. Mr. Lutz said the Town of Farragut was ready to sign on based on the formula adopted by the Policy Board that gave cost recovery, participation, and updates but they said they would now await our response to the group purchase. If something was offered to the Town of Farragut it would have to be offered to all parties. Mayor Ashe reminded the Policy Board that they need the product but we do not need them. Mr. Reece stated that the original rate structure was based on other people tying on to the system but there is no official rate as yet. Mr. Fleming made a recommendation that the finance committee meet and come back to the Policy Board to make a recommendation at the November 8 meeting. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee and finance committee would get together to come up with a recommendation to bring before the Board. Mr. Fleming called for other questions or comments.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Ashe made a motion the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Fleming seconded. All agreed to adjourn.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, November 8, 1993, 8:30 a.m., City/County Building, Room 549

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING November 8, 1993 8:30 a.m. City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering, Representing Mayor Victor Ashe

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Systems; Mr. Dick Moran, Automated Systems; Ms. Patsy Miller, County Executive's Office

#### CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the previous Policy Board Meeting of September 17, 1993 were brought to the floor for approval. Mr. Parnell made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. Fleming. Approved

#### PROPOSAL FOR REFINEMENT OF LEVEL 2 PARTICIPANT LICENSEES

Mr. Lutz sent all members a summary of the digital landbase sales proposal with their agenda. The finance representatives from the three GIS participants got together and devised a strategy which would not subsidize anyone who acquires a level 2 license. The non-subsidy aspect of the license was one of the important points. The new rates provide for a volume discount if you purchase at least 25% of the total amount of sheets. You get a sliding discount depending on how many you purchase above that level. Recommendations also include a provision for what has been called a take-it-and-run license - you buy it, you take it, you pay the license fee and it's yours, no updates. If you want updates you have to come back and re-buy. The new rates also add the caveat that if several entities buy as a consortium and some opt for the take-it-and-run approach and some pay an annual maintenance fee, the take-it-and-run licensees will not be entitled to the consortium discount for any future updates. If they were purchasing more than 350 map sheets they would get a discount but would not get the discount for the whole consortium. The minimum annual usage fee entitles the licensee to updates no more than quarterly. The licensee would pay for the media and GIS labor fees related to



downloading of the information. License fee to be financed for up to ten years at Wall Street Journal published prime rate.

Mr. Fleming asked where this recommendation was and Mr. Lutz replied that it was adopted at the last meeting of the finance group, carried verbally to the Technical Committee. They did not want to finance for 15 years.

Mr. Parnell asked what the licensees planned to do with the data they received. Were they going to add to it and if so, did we have any requirements that data come back to the GIS if changes were made. Mr. Lutz stated there were no requirements as proposed that changes be given to the GIS on data but that this was going to be negotiated on an individual basis.

Mr. Parnell asked what they planned to do with the data. Mr. Lutz said LCUB and some others planned to put utility features, site-plan analyses, drainage, addresses, zoning over the landbase. Mr. Parnell stated that from the city's standpoint, they would like to know what the licensees were doing with the data obtained from GIS. Mr. Lutz stated that the original plan was too open ended and we would like to see their information but it will probably be a year or two before it would be at the point where it was worth reviewing.

Mr. Parnell made a motion to approve level 2 license participants. Mr. Fleming asked what the recommendation was. Mr. Lutz replied that the recommendation was the last page in the handout on arrangement 1 and 2 which had the associated fees as listed in the tables attached. Mr. Fleming asked for an explanation of the original investment charge and minimum annual update fee - were these something that we could put our hands on. Mr. Lutz replied that the original investment charge was established when we came out with the original level 2 participant license agreement, which is \$2.6 million. Mr. Fleming asked to re-ask his question, stating that he understood what the \$2.6 million was but wanted to know what the re-sell rate was that was adopted by the Policy Board. Mr. Fleming stated that as he understood the proposal it was linked to this re-sell rate as a discount to this particular rate schedule. Mr. Reece stated that in his opinion this was a different rate schedule, but that the level 2 rate schedule was still in effect. Mr. Fleming said he had no argument with the motion, but did not know what was to be approved and that there should be some sort of rate schedule or piece of paper that says what it is. Mr. Fleming stated he could not read what he was given but that it looked like a lot of technical working papers. Mr. Fleming offered an amendment to Mr. Parnell's motion and seconded the motion contingent upon Mr. Lutz providing a tariff sheet rate schedule that is understandable and says these are the terms you will find if you select this option or that option, and rather than wait until the next meeting sign off on it. Mr. Fleming requested a piece of paper that can be handed to each licensee that has a rate schedule that they can look at and understand. Mr. Fleming asked if there was a second on the second question and if he could constitute that as a motion. Mr. Parnell seconded.

Mr. Fleming asked Mr. Parnell as a point of discussion if it was important to finance this for this group. Mr. Lutz replied that First Utility felt it was too expensive at the 6% prime rate they were quoted. Mr. Lutz was told by the finance people that if someone had a bond issue

that was going out that they could tack the money to it would be cheaper. Mr. Fleming asked if we did not offer a financing arrangement would it deter our ability to sell these on the working table. Mr. Lutz replied that it would for Lenoir City. Mr. Reece stated that he felt there was a need for an option of financing. Mr. Fleming said his assumption is that his original motion included a provision for financing pursuant to the finance committee's recommendation. Mr. Fleming called for a vote on the motion. No opposition. Mr. Fleming asked Mr. Lutz to put it in some sort of paraphrase.

## **GRIFFITH-ARCHER JOB DESCRIPTIONS**

Mr. Lutz stated that existing KGIS job descriptions were sent to Griffith-Archer to be modified to comply with ADA requirements. The GIS job descriptions were examined by Griffith-Archer as a part of a County-funded job classification and salary study. Griffith-Archer produced job descriptions for the 5 jobs currently filled in the GIS department. They were sent to the Technical Committee which made changes and to Mintha Roach, who reviewed them and recommended several changes. Mr. Fleming asked if there were salary ranges to go along with the job descriptions. Mr. Lutz stated that the Technical Committee felt it should hold off on adopting those for now because they needed to be reviewed more. Mr. Fleming asked how important this was to approve today. He stated that he did not like getting the agenda the Friday before a Monday meeting. Mr. Fleming expressed his confidence in the Technical Committee and finance committee but the time frame Mr. Lutz allowed to preview the Policy Board agenda items did not give him time to do his own checking with the people involved to consider their advice. Mr. Fleming told Mr. Lutz the Technical Committee needed to meet sooner than they have been to allow time for these things to be put in a package form.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Parnell made a motion the meeting be adjourned. Second by Mr. Fleming.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Friday, January 21, 1994, 10:00 a.m., City-County Building, Room 549.

# AMENDED COPY

# MINUTES

## POLICY BOARD MEETING

January 31, 1994 8:30 a.m.

City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, General Manager, KUB; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Richard Moran, Knox County Automated Systems; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Ms. Amanda Templeton, Knox County Finance; Mr. John Bacon, Bacon, Howard and Company, Certified Public Accountants

### CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fleming called the meeting of the KGIS Policy Board to order. Motion was made by Mr. Fleming to approve the minutes from the November 8, 1993 Policy Board Meeting. Second by Mr. Kessel. All approved.

### CHANGE OF CHAIRMANSHIP

Mr. Fleming reminded the Board of the rotation for chairmanship. Mr. Fleming nominated Mayor Ashe, second by Mr. Kessel. Mayor Ashe requested Mr. Fleming chair the meeting for today. All approved.

### RATE SHEET FOR HIGH VOLUME DATA LICENSE AGREEMENT

Mr. Lutz reminded the members of the adoption of the high volume agreement from the last Policy Board Meeting subject to the provision of a rate sheet which explained the rates for the various levels of map sheet purchases. That sheet and a license agreement have been prepared by the three finance representatives of the Policy Board members. These have been approved as to form by the Knox County Law Office. Mayor Ashe asked if any of the legal representatives at the City or KUB had received a copy of the agreement. Mr. Lutz stated that a copy would be provided for them. Mayor Ashe asked if the Policy Board had a legal council. Mr. Lutz and Mr. Kessel stated that the GIS is technically part of the County and has used their law department in areas that required it. Any policy is always reviewed by the Policy Board. Mayor Ashe suggested a special

board in the event of legal action against the KGIS or its Policy Board. He expressed his concern over the lawsuit by KUB against the Lenoir City Utilities Board and any contract the Policy Board may have in the future with them. The Policy Board was reminded that all contracts had to be approved by the Policy Board and all members would be aware of any pending contracts.

Mr. Fleming made a motion to adopt the high volume rate sheet. Second by Mayor Ashe. All approved.

Mr. Kessel asked if there was a provision in the contract that kept participating agencies from selling the data provided them by the KGIS. Mr. Lutz replied that a data license agreement had to be signed by consultants who used the information provided by KGIS that was sold to the participant.

#### **LOW VOLUME DATA LICENSE MODIFICATIONS**

Mr. Lutz stated that the Knox County, City, and KUB finance representatives met and realized an inconsistency in the pricing basis of single map sheet licenses compared to large volume licenses. The same pricing rational applied to the low volume sheets, cuts the cost of per sheet pricing from \$300.00 per theme to \$200.00 per theme. The Technical Committee recommended the Policy Board adopt the new low volume rate. Motion made by Mr. Kessel to adopt the low volume date license, second by Mayor Ashe. All approved.

#### **AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY UPDATE APPROPRIATION CHANGE**

Mr. Lutz stated that \$150,000.00 was budgeted for aerial photography for the 93-94 fiscal year. The update area for 1993 was in an area of greater growth than in previous years and the costs per sheet were higher than estimated. Cost estimates were based on costs for the other three areas of the county that had been done previously. This area of the county was in West Knoxville/Farragut which has had the greatest growth in recent years. This has completed the first update of the entire county. Mr. Lutz asked that an additional \$30,000.00 be appropriated from the existing aerial reserve fund to cover these additional costs. The probability of increasing the appropriation was discussed during the budget presentation and does not entail raising additional revenues. Mr. Kessel asked if these numbers would continue to be escalated. Mr. Lutz replied that different approaches were being considered for the update process and that it would probably be around \$200,000.00 a year in the future. Mr. Fleming made a motion to approve the request to increase the aerial photography appropriation from \$150,000.00 to \$180,000.00. Mr. Kessel seconded. All approved.

#### **AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY 1994 RFP**

Mr. Lutz reminded the Policy Board of the request for proposal which was issued in December 1993 for aerial photography conversion services for 1994. Five proposals were



received and sent to representatives of the City, County and KUB as well as the KGIS staff for review. The Technical Committee will be meeting today at 2:30 to make a final decision on a vendor. Several factors and qualifications are considered in the choice of a vendor - cost being one of them. The final selection will be presented to the Policy Board Members for final approval prior to the next meeting, because the photography needs to be flown in March.

### **1993 ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

Mr. Lutz provided the Policy Board attendees with a list of accomplishments of the GIS for 1993.

### **KGIS AUDIT (REPORT BY JOHN BACON)**

Mr. Lutz turned the meeting over to Mr. John Bacon from Bacon, Howard and Company. Mr. Bacon stated there were several changes made in the presentation of the KGIS audit report. These changes were to bring the GIS up to date and move them from a modified accrual to an accrual reporting method. This method of accounting will reflect what is actually being done. One additional change was to record the cost of compensated absences. Those have never been recorded as liabilities in the past and show a significant change. There was also a change in contributed in kind services. Bacon, Howard was not able to determine all the costs of contributed services. The county bookkeeping system does not have a unit which tracks this. There are also costs associated with record keeping that are not included.

Mr. Bacon stated that Mr. Lutz should be provided monthly financial statements from the finance department and then in turn should provide the Policy Board with quarterly financial reports. Mr. Fleming made a motion seconded by Mr. Kessel that these be provided. All approved.

Mr. Lutz stated that the Tri-Party agreement stated that any monies in the fund balance be re-distributed to the participants July 1, but the books are not closed by then and fund balances are not known.

Mr. Fleming asked about the \$650,000.00 user fees and did they represent the entire contributions of the participants. He asked if we were debt free. Mr. Bacon replied that most of that money was listed as contributed capital but most of the money coming in now was from fees. The money the county put in was recorded as contributed capital and not as a liability. Mr. Fleming stated that he was probably looking for a breakdown on the bond issue. Mr. Lutz stated that the audit report did not reflect the collections of debt services from City/County/KUB because they were shown on the Knox County audit. Mr. Bacon stated that the easiest way to designate this is with a footnote at the end of the financial statement.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mayor Ashe asked that the next meeting be changed from Monday, March 14, to Wednesday, March 16, as he had a conflict. Mr. Kessel made a motion to move the meeting, second by Mr. Fleming. All approved.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kessel made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Second by Mr. Fleming. All agreed.

**NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, March 16, 1994, City-County Building, Room 549, 8:30 a.m.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

March 16, 1994 8:30 a.m.

City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Knox County Finance; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Richard Roller, City Computer Center

### CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mayor Ashe called the meeting to order. Mr. Lutz noted one change to the minutes of the January 31, 1994, Policy Board meeting. Page 2, under Low Volume Data License Modification should be changed from "directors" to "representatives". Motion made by Mr. Kessel to accept the minutes with the change as noted. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

### WEST KNOX CONSORTIUM

Mr. Lutz read an Amendment to Section 3.06 of the License Agreement. The License Agreement was approved at the last Policy Board Meeting. This amendment was recommended by the Technical Committee to provide the KGIS with some type of benefit from the proposed usage by the West Knox Consortium. The amendment provides KGIS with feedback on a yearly basis of the usage of the data they would be providing the West Knox group. Motion made by Mr. Kessel to add the Amendment Section 3.06 of the License Agreement. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

### GIS OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT AND MIGRATION/EXPANSION PLAN

Mr. Lutz described the efforts KGIS staff had made over the last 2 years to develop a migration plan which would move the GIS from the VAX computer and move it to up-to-date technology and allow the GIS to service more users at a reduced cost. This plan is the result of a two year effort by the Technical Committee and GIS staff. We have learned from this effort that we need outside expertise to advise us on all the issues. The Technical Committee at its last meeting voted

The Technical Committee re-discussed the job descriptions and changed the title of one job description from Micro-Systems to Systems Analyst, and propose the same recommendations that were discussed in November. These job descriptions are to meet ADA requirements and have been reviewed by City, County, KUB and Civil Service personnel. The current salary ranges were adopted by the Policy Board in 1987 and reflect the COLA increases for each year. Proposed ranges were recommended by Griffith-Archer and do not change any existing salaries. Motion made by Mr. Kessel to adopt the salary ranges and descriptions as per attachment and recommendations by the Technical Committee members. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

### **PRELIMINARY GIS BUDGET**

The Technical Committee has reviewed and modified the attached budget proposal. An increase of \$50,000.00 for aerial photography has been requested based on analysis of the last four year's updates. A proposal has been received that provides for all sheets in the County to be updated over a four year period for a cost of \$839,000.00. The proposal also allows for an annual escape clause. The present request is for \$200,000.00 which allows for maintenance of the base map. Formal adoption is not requested, just feedback.

Salary and fringe benefits reflect a budgeted 3% COLA with 2.5% for merit adjustment. As in the past the COLA will be dependent upon the City, County, and KUB average for the next fiscal year.

Mayor Ashe asked for a breakdown of the travel and training amounts. Mr. Lutz stated that training costs would most likely be paid out of upgrade reserves as part of the overall migration plan. Training is based on four employees attending classes in either Huntsville, AL or Atlanta, GA. at Intergraph training sites. Class length and costs vary from two to five days. Mayor Ashe suggested that City or County vehicles be used for travel if possible. Mayor Ashe requested a cost breakdown before the final approval of the budget.



## **FINANCIAL REPORT (PRESENTED BY KATHY HAMILTON)**

Ms. Hamilton stated that the same format would be used for the interim financial reports as the annual statement. The transmittal letter points out status of reserve funds. Page four shows that there has been a smooth flow of income versus expenditure. Motion made by Mr. Kessel that the report be filed. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kessel made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

## **NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Fleming will not be able to attend a May 9 meeting. A new date for the week of May 9 will be set up and Policy Board members notified of the new meeting date.

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

May 12, 1994 9:00 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Larry Fleming, KUB General Manager; Mr. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ms. Kathy Hamilton, Knox County Finance; Ms. Patsy Miller, County Executive's Office

### **CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mayor Ashe called the meeting of the Policy Board to order. Motion made by Mr. Fleming to approve the minutes from the March 16, 1994 meeting. Second by Mayor Ashe. Approved

### **GIS OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT AND MIGRATION/EXPANSION PLAN**

Mr. Lutz stated that a plan of study has been worked out with Plangraphics, Inc. that includes meetings with the City/County/KUB offices currently using and who will in the future be using the GIS. Details were distributed to the Policy Board members in their agenda packet along with the hours required and trips involved in the study. Approval is needed from the Policy Board to appropriate \$37,500.00 from the upgrade reserve account, with approval from the Policy Board to sign the agreement.

Migration/expansion is considered because on the present VAX system there is no software support on the LAN-based side. We can only support what we are doing because Intergraph has moved over to the workstation. City/County/KUB users who would like to access information from the system can not be supported. We have been trying for the past year to devise a migration plan to make a gradual move to a different platform. Intergraph has been unable to satisfy everyone so the Technical Committee has suggested an outside consultant. Plangraphics did the original GIS study and is familiar with our setup and system. They have also done other consulting for us and the Technical Committee supports them as the choice for this study. We hope to have a plan and a recommendation that will state what needs to be done to best serve all the users of the system.

Mr. Fleming made a motion that the chairman be authorized to sign the agreement with

Plangraphics and that \$37,500.00 be appropriated from reserve funds. Ms. Patsy Miller (representing Mr. Kessel) seconded the motion. Approved

## **GIS BUDGET**

Mr. Lutz stated this budget is the same as the one introduced at the March 16, 1994 meeting: capital outlay requests have been added - \$30,000.00 from upgrade reserve funds for continuance and \$200,000.00 from aerial for updates for this year's aerial photography. Reserve fund balances were not available when the agenda packet was sent. Current reserve fund as of March 21, 1994, in the upgrade reserves is \$762,205.00 and the aerial photography reserve fund is \$51,512.00, which does not include contributions for next year's budget.

Travel and training budget of \$11,500 was not all spent this year, with next year's budget reflecting an increase to allow for travel/training of the new employee to the Intergraph training center, and Intergraph training for the new software we plan to purchase this next year.

Contract services are in three areas: Automated Services, the Knox County Computer department to give us seven-day-a-week, twenty-four hour-a-day computer coverage to cover the routers, plotters, backups for us; Audit expenses, to Bacon, Howard for the yearly audit; Finance Department costs, an estimate provided by the finance department of Knox County to cover payroll processing and indirect costs. Kathy Hamilton should be able to provide a fee schedule/rates for the Policy Board before the fee is paid.

Office space rent has increased \$8,600.00 based on a per square foot pro rata share.

Aerial photography has been increased from \$150,000.00 to \$200,000.00 based on the number of sheets to be updated. At present we have updated approximately 43% of the total sheets in the county. A proposal was received for \$837,000.00 which would update all the sheets over the next four years. Anyone buying in on the GIS would pay a percentage of whatever is spent on updates. The Technical Committee reviewed and endorses the budget for the increase in aerial photography costs.

Mr. Fleming made a motion the budget be approved. Mr. Kessel seconded. Approved

## **APPROPRIATION INCREASE FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASE**

Last year's budget allowed for \$30,000.00 for equipment purchases. There were some unexpected expenses: a new CPU, plot software and routers. Mr. Fleming made a motion the increase of \$12,000.00 be approved. Second by Mr. Kessel. Approved

## **WEST KNOX CONSORTIUM**

Present participants in the West Knox consortium are the Town of Farragut, First Utility

District, and Lenoir City Utility Board. This may include at a later date TDS and Concord Telephone. The costs at present are based on the original three organizations. Assuming only these three organizations join the consortium and that they pay the license fee in a lump sum rather than finance it, the revenue from this agreement would be \$301,912.00. The Town of Farragut and First Utility District have both indicated that they will probably participate in the update program which will bring in an additional \$11,000.00 toward the update costs, assuming the \$200,000.00 for update costs on next year's budget. The consortium members would be cut and run, not tied to our system. Exhibit 2 of the license agreement covers updates: 1 hour of KGIS support work for each 20 licensed map sheets. The license agreement drafted here was taken from a previous contract used with Plangraphics and is the same as the one we have with the University of Tennessee.

Mr. Fleming made a motion that the chairman of the Policy Board be authorized to sign the agreement pending approval and satisfaction of the City Law Department. If not approved, a special meeting would be called of the Policy Board by the chairman to further discuss the content of the agreement.

Mayor Ashe wished to comment on the lawsuit between LCUB and KUB. Mayor Ashe raised the question of why we facilitate an organization that would not facilitate us in either the city or the county. Mayor Ashe felt that some leverage was being allowed to go by.

Mr. Kessel stated there would not be a problem with LCUB if they paid the license agreement fee for the services they would be receiving. Their lawsuit involves taxes and should not prevent them from becoming a member of the consortium.

Mr. Fleming stated that from KUB's perspective one of the things that was helpful for them was having knowledge of the other facilities. One of the conditions prior to this contract that there was concern about was what information they had to provide to the KGIS. There is a provision that requires them to provide facility information for the area covered by the license agreement. KUB's course of action with LCUB has already been set and any agreement with them would be separate from that action.

Mr. Lutz stated that LCUB is also the largest participant in the consortium and their withdrawal would injure the Town of Farragut and First Utility District because their costs would increase dramatically with LCUB's nonparticipation.

Mr. Lutz stated the consortium requested a modification of Article 3. Section 3.03 after the paragraph ending ..."KGIS Data improperly":

**Licensee shall have the right to sell "hard copies" to individuals or businesses at a price set by Licensee to cover duplication costs. No digital data may be sold by the Licensee unless authorized by the Licensor in writing.**

Mr. Fleming made a motion to include the amendment to Article 3. Section 3.03. He also made a motion to authorize the chair to sign the agreement subject to the mayor signing off on it. If the mayor does not wish to sign off, a special meeting of the Policy Board would be called. Second by Mr. Kessel. Approved



## **FINANCIAL REPORT (KATHY HAMILTON)**

Ms. Hamilton stated that the letter in the front of the financial statement discloses the status of the reserve funds - those not in the body of the financial statement. The cash figure within the report includes \$813,717.00 which is cash from the reserve funds, which includes \$51,512.00 in the aerial reserve. Page 4 shows a net operating gain year-to-date and includes contributions for user service fees that go into the reserve fund. Fourth quarter revenues will be reflected in the final statement. The Policy Board will be provided a draft copy of the financial statement as of the end of June 1994 which will not include payables.

To comment on the \$5,000.00 from the contract services: these costs are based on costs from the indirect cost audit. It is based on the full blown indirect costs that David Griffith, Inc. provides, and include paper costs, checks, computer reports and allocation of individuals who work on GIS accounting and payroll in the finance department.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Ashe stated that if there were no further business the meeting would stand adjourned.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Monday, July 11, 1994, City-County Building, Room 549, 8:30 a.m.

## **MINUTES**

### **POLICY BOARD MEETING**

July 11, 1994 8:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, KUB General Manager; Mr. Dwight Kessel, Knox County Executive; Mr. Sam Parnell, representing Mayor Ashe

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Ms. Kathy Ayres, Metropolitan Planning Commission

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Steve DeMik, Knox County Finance

### **CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Parnell called the meeting of the Policy Board to order. Motion made by Mr. Fleming to approve the minutes from the May 12, 1994 meeting. Second by Mr. Parnell. Approved

### **GIS OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT AND MIGRATION/EXPANSION PLAN**

Mr. Lutz presented a brief overview of the status of the operations assessment and migration/expansion plan. There was a workshop held on June 13 attended by approximately 65 people from the different agencies within the City, County, and KUB. This workshop was to introduce the concepts of a GIS and try to involve non-participants. A questionnaire was passed out to all the people who attended to use as a means of assessing the different needs of each agency. PlanGraphics met with the current users the day following the workshop to learn about the system status, problems with usage, and areas for needed improvement. The week of June 27, a representative from PlanGraphics met with potential users to follow-up on the questionnaires that were returned and explore their ideas and concerns for their use of the GIS. Mr. Lutz provided a list of potential users who attended meetings with the representative. Based on the present schedule, a recommendation should be available for the Policy Board at the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Fleming asked for clarification of the purpose of meeting with non-users. Mr. Lutz stated these meetings were to find out what other organizations would benefit from what the GIS has. This would make them aware of what is available on the system and to see what needs they may have that the GIS could meet.

Mr. Kessel reminded those present that the staff members at different locations have a tendency to change over a period of time. He suggested that Mr. Lutz set aside a time maybe twice a year to contact the different agencies who might benefit from a GIS to find out if there have been any personnel changes in the last six months. This way the GIS department would have a current list of points of contact at the different agencies in and around the county.

Mr. Fleming asked if there might be some value in bringing in some outside firms, such as Barge and Waggoner, since KUB and the County use outside groups to do certain types of development. He suggested that several representatives from these firms might be used as a focus group to represent these particular factions.

Mr. Lutz stated that an important item that has come out in this study is the need to have subdivision information put on the system the day it is brought in to the MPC. Most engineering firms would rather submit this information digitally, and it would be more cost effective to receive it in this manner. Mr. Kessel made a motion that Mr. Lutz work on a plan with Mr. Whittaker to have the subdivision information provided in digital format in the future with a final proposal to be brought to the Policy Board at a later date. Second by Mr. Parnell. Approved.

#### **WEST KNOX CONSORTIUM**

Mr. Lutz reminded the members that the license agreement was approved at the last policy board meeting. The Town of Farragut, LCUB and First Utility have all received approval from their boards to proceed. A check for \$6,000 has been received from the Town of Farragut as a down payment on their license agreement. If Concord Telephone decides to join the consortium, the costs to the other participants will be reduced. (See worksheets) Revenues from the consortium will be split between the three policy board agencies, since this is a return on the original investment costs.

Mr. Fleming asked how this would impact the migration plan and the new platform that KUB will be purchasing. Will their costs be adjusted when new equipment is purchased? Mr. Lutz stated that their costs do not include our hardware investment costs and they would have to provide their own hardware and software to use the information the GIS will be providing.

Mr. Lutz referred the Policy Board members to the yearly update option. This is a one-time option based on the amount currently being contributed to the update reserve. The consortium members would pay a yearly fee for as long as they desired updates at a set rate designated in the original license agreement. If the consortium members opt to receive yearly updates they will automatically be provided updates as frequently as quarterly. If they choose not to receive yearly updates, they would have to pay the original cost of the license agreement in order to receive updates at a later

date. Their other option would be to purchase only those sheets they needed when they needed them.

Mr. Fleming asked when the contracts would be ready for signature. Mr. Lutz stated that everything will be final in the next two to three weeks and the contracts will be signed by the Policy Board Chairman as decided at the May Policy Board Meeting. Mr. Kessel would like to talk to West Knox Utility to see why they are not interested before the final contracts are signed. Mr. Lutz will provide Mr. Kessel with a worksheet that includes West Knox Utility in the final costs.

#### **GIS COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS**

Mr. Lutz provided the Policy Board with the actual COLA for the GIS employees: 3.25%, the average of 5% for the County, 2.25% for KUB, and 2.5% for the City.

#### **FINANCIAL REPORT (STEVE DEMIK)**

Mr. DeMik handed out copies of the general ledger balance sheet. Since the auditors are performing the audit at this time, this is an unaudited, unreviewed cash basis financial statement. Any payable received after the first of July will not be posted. Fourth quarter depreciation has not been recorded, and compensated absences are not figured yet. This data is being gathered now by the auditors. The final audit will be ready the first of September.

Mr. Kessel stated that the Policy Board should decide what should be carried as a fund balance and for what reason. Mr. Lutz said that at the end of the audit, any unspent funds were credited back and were not carried as a separate undesignated reserve in the past. Mr. Kessel would like to carry a stand-by fund for future loss/revenues. Mr. DeMik stated that this is done by the state as a rainy-day fund and could be done in the future.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Kessel made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Second by Mr. Fleming.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, September 14, 1994, City-County Building, Room 549, 9:30 a.m.



## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING

September 14, 1994 9:30 a.m.  
City-County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry A. Fleming, KUB General Manager; Mr. Thomas H. Schumpert, Knox County Executive; Mr. Sam Parnell, representing Mayor Ashe

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. John R. Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Steve deMik, Knox County Finance; Mr. Drew Lancaster, KUB Information Services; Mr. Richard Roller, City Information Systems; Mr. Jim York, City Finance

### CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting called to order by Mr. Parnell. Welcome to Mr. Schumpert. Minutes from previous meeting presented for approval. Motion by Mr. Fleming to accept minutes as written. Second by Mr. Schumpert. Approved

### DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS FROM WEST KNOX CONSORTIUM

Mr. Lutz stated the contracts with the West Knox Consortium (consisting of The Town of Farragut, First Utility District, and Lenoir City Utilities Board) were executed by the Mayor on August 30, 1994. The value of the license agreements is \$301,912.00, and the money from Farragut and First Utility has been received.

One matter needing to be discussed was how to distribute the proceeds from the Consortium. Mr. Lutz met with the Technical Committee and separately with the finance representatives from each of the three policy board agencies: Mr. Jim York from City Finance, Ms. Kathy Hamilton from Knox County Finance, and Ms. Beth Bowman from KUB Finance. The Technical Committee unanimously decided the proceeds should be split in equal thirds and distributed by direct reimbursement. The remaining question was whether a portion of the money be retained and placed in a fund balance for GIS operation. This question was deferred to the finance representatives. Mr. deMik stated that an analysis was done of cash reserves and operating needs at the end of each month. Mr. York stated a recommendation was made that \$50,000.00 be placed in reserve to cover operating. Mr. Lutz stated that Intergraph is billing maintenance monthly, while GIS is doing quarterly billing. The \$50,000.00 would be available to cover disbursements until the non-GIS agencies paid their quarterly maintenance.

Mr. Fleming made a motion that the proceeds from the West Knox Consortium be reduced by \$50,000.00 to be placed in an operating contingency to provide additional working capital, and the remaining proceeds be divided equally into thirds and directly disbursed to each of the agencies. Second by Mr. Schumpert. Approved

## **STATUS OF GIS OPERATIONS ASSESSMENT AND MIGRATION/EXPANSION PLAN**

Mr. Lutz summarized the contract with PlanGraphics begun in June 1994, to provide an operations assessment and migration plan. First phase was to look at current users of GIS and non-users to assess whether GIS would be a good option for them and what the barriers are to getting them on GIS. Results of this study were presented in a working paper submitted at the end of July. A copy of the Working Paper was distributed with the meeting agenda packet. The working paper dealt with three alternatives for the GIS in the future: 1) keep the current system and use it; 2) upgrade part of the system, basically the city/county landbase maintenance part to new hardware and software, KUB remain on the VAX until an upgrade became feasible for them; 3) everyone upgrade immediately to the new platform. The second and third alternatives have two sub-alternatives: a) continue with Intergraph hardware and software OR b) issue an RFP and solicit bids from new vendors and see what we get. PlanGraphics recommendation and the alternative favored by the Technical Committee was alternative 2A - the hybrid system, city and county upgrading immediately (being interpreted as 12-18 months) and KUB remain on the VAX system for 2-3 years and eventually migrate to the new software on an Intergraph platform.

A meeting with the project manager from PlanGraphics is scheduled for Friday to finish the outline for final plan delivery. This plan will outline the steps involved, timing, who buys what, how to support the existing system, what training requirements can be expected, how is maintenance going to be covered on the existing system, cost estimates on hardware and software, how do we translate the database to the new system and back to the VAX so KUB can remain current until they migrate.

Mr. Fleming asked if there would be more detailed consulting with the project manager by the various agencies. Mr. Lutz stated that would probably be necessary and a pilot would actually have to be done before final plans could be made. Mr. Reece said they would have to have additional consulting advice to set the direction and detail the needs of each department.

Mr. Fleming asked if there was money to support the migration. Mr. Lutz stated that there is money, but who paid for what would have to be discussed. Where does what GIS pays for end and City/County/KUB costs begin? This will determine if there are adequate funds.

Mr. Fleming asked if there were concerns with running two systems. Mr. Lutz said no, that some initial pilot work has already been done on this converting our data to the new environment and back. There may be some problems moving data back and forth, but theoretically it should work. You do not know until you actually begin using the system what type of problems may come up.

Mr. Fleming asked if Mr. Lutz fully supported the Technical Committee's approach. Mr. Lutz said yes, but it would take 12-18 months. Whatever system the property assessor has at the end of the tax year will determine whether they can migrate at that time or not. The property assessor will need to remain on the same system for the entire tax year. Mr. Fleming asked what the time frame for this plan was. Mr. Lutz stated that at the next meeting he would come back with a plan including hardware and software initial purchases for a pilot project to begin this year. Possibly 60 to 90 days. Cost estimates could be available at the next Policy Board meeting.

#### **FINANCIAL REPORT (STEVE DEMIK)**

Mr. deMik handed out prepared statements reminding members that the audit being performed by Bacon and Howard will not be finished until the end of the month. There are some adjustments that have not been booked. There was an operating gain of \$72,475.00 bringing the retained deficit down to \$15,497.00. Mr. Fleming asked how a gain should be viewed. Mr. deMik stated a gain was good because the GIS was in the business to cover their costs. The cost of operating the GIS (revenues) is starting to cover itself. It is always good to have a profit figure for future expenses. Mr. Lutz stated we are finally catching up on the depreciation and this is driving the retained deficits down. Mr. Schumpert asked how this compared to prior years. Mr. Lutz stated this is only the second year it has been stated like this. Last year showed a loss due mainly to depreciation, which was not considered prior to last year. Mr. York stated that last year was the first year it was treated as a proprietary fund.

Mr. deMik stated there were a few adjustments that would still be made. Interest receivable will increase the income once it is booked. License fees are also listed as revenues on this statement.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Schumpert made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Second by Mr. Fleming. Approved

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday, November 14, 8:30 a.m., room 549.

## MINUTES

### POLICY BOARD MEETING November 28, 1994 3:00 p.m. City/County Building, Room 549

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Larry Fleming, KUB General Manager; Mayor Victor Ashe, City of Knoxville; Mr. Thomas Schumpert, Knox County Executive

**STAFF PRESENT:** Ms. Kathy Ayres, Metropolitan Planning Commission; Mr. John Lutz, Geographic Information System; Mr. Dick Moran, Automated Systems Division; Mr. Sam Parnell, City Engineering; Mr. David Reece, KUB Information Services; Mr. Richard Roller, City Information Systems

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Peter Crowell, PlanGraphics, Inc.; Ms. Kathy Hamilton, County Finance; Ms. Gerda Mayo, City Finance; Mr. Gary Murr, City Engineering; Mr. Kevin Wilson, County Finance; Mr. Jim York, City Finance

#### CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Policy Board Meeting called to order by Chairman Ashe. Motion to accept minutes from meeting of September 14, 1994, as written made by Mr. Fleming, second by Mr. Schumpert. Approved

#### KGIS BUSINESS

Mr. Lutz presented two items of business: 1) approval requested for the Mayor to sign a letter received from PBA to pay \$2,598.00 for construction to build a wall and door in the GIS office area, and 2) checks distributed to KUB, City of Knoxville and Knox County for their portion of the West Knox Consortium license agreement proceeds. Motion made by Mr. Schumpert to approve payment for construction. Second by Mr. Fleming. Approved

#### AUDIT PRESENTATION (Ms. Hamilton)

Ms. Hamilton distributed copies of the final audit. Notice was given that a correction would be made in the area of capital outlay. There was an amount left in the equipment as a capital item that should not have been. The auditors made an adjustment and took out of capital all the aerial photography updates and listed them as an expense. After they made the initial entry, there was an additional accounts payable sent up to finance that was not caught and recorded. It affected the property and equipment line. There is \$14,175.00 in the property and equipment line that needs to go over to contracted services, which is currently listed as \$580,255.00 (p.5). Corrections will be made to the final audit and revised copies distributed.



Ms. Hamilton pointed out that the auditors were asked to change their method of depreciating by taking the assets first against contributed capital. They have done so, which shows up on p. 5 as \$1.1 million in 1993 and \$5,700.00 in 1994. This is so noted in the property adjustment.

In the notes, more of an explanation has been provided, most notably on p. 8 under budgetary information. Pointed out in this note is a breakdown of retained earnings, the amount contained in equipment reserve, software reserve and aerial photography.

The supplementary letter contains information concerning the bond issue and responsibility for payments. It is the result of new auditing standards requiring additional information to be passed along to the Policy Board members.

#### KGIS MIGRATION PLAN PRESENTATION (Mr. Croswell)

Mr. Lutz gave an introduction and summary of the need to migrate to a new hardware and software platform in the KGIS. Mr. Peter Croswell was introduced as the consultant assigned by PlanGraphics, Inc. to do the overall study of the KGIS to come up with a plan of migration.

Mr. Croswell stated his visit was the culmination of the visit he made in June. A history of the current KGIS system was presented, along with the limitations and needs of the current system. Recommendations, timelines, costs and justification are included in the Final KGIS Migration Plan documentation, submitted November 17, 1994. Copies are available from the GIS office.

Estimated cost for Phase 1 of the plan is \$64,000.00. Mr. Fleming made a motion to move forward with Phase 1 of the plan. Ms. Mayo expressed concern that the proposal should reflect calendar dates for completion of tasks with fines applied to assure the vendor meets deadlines. Mr. Fleming requested this be reflected in the minutes as part of his motion. Second by Mr. Schumpert. Approved

Ms. Hamilton requested that cost information be received in the participating agencies on a timely basis to allow time to make decisions. A recommendation was made that the three financial representatives from the Policy Board agencies meet to come up with these costs. Mr. Fleming made a motion the financial representatives from each entity meet to make recommendations on funding this migration. Second by Mr. Parnell representing Mayor Ashe. Approved

#### ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Fleming. Second by Mr. Schumpert. Meeting adjourned

#### NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, March 15, 1995, 10:00 a.m., City/County Building, room 549