



GIS Policy Committee

MINUTES – APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED – 10/16/15

DATE: Friday, July 17, 2015
TIME: 11:00 am
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
 Brookens Administrative Center
 1776 E. Washington St.
 Urbana, Illinois

Consortium Member Agencies	Present	Absent
Champaign		Mark Toalson
Urbana	Sanford Hess (Vice-Chair)	
Rantoul	Pete Passarelli	
Champaign County	Deb Busey	
UIUC	Pam Voitik (Chair)	
Mahomet		Kelly Pfeifer
Savoy	Levi Kopmann	

Others: Patrick Brown (Mahomet Alternate)
CCGIS Staff: Leanne Brehob-Riley (Director), Linda Lane (Recording Secretary)

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Ms. Voitik as Chair called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll call was taken by written record and a quorum was declared present.

III. Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Ms. Busey to approve the agenda as distributed; seconded by Mr. Hess. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. April 17, 2015 Regular Meeting

Ms. Voitik noted that Ms. Pfeifer approved an item but was listed as absent from the meeting. Mr. Hess noted that he is listed as being chair of the meeting when he was not; however, he did motion to adjourn.

MOTION by Mr. Hess to approve the minutes of the April 17, 2015 regular meeting as amended; seconded by Mr. Passarelli. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

V. Financial Statements

A. FY2015 – 1/1/15 through 6/30/15

Ms. Riley noted that membership contributions and orthophotography assessment fees have yet to be collected, and principal data client revenues are beginning to be processed. Mr. Hess asked if charges for services and map and data sales are cyclical throughout the year. Ms. Riley explained that map and data sales patterns fluctuate each year although, charges for services typically increase during the summer months.

1 **MOTION** by Ms. Busey to receive and place on file the financial statements of FY2015 – 1/1/15 through 6/30/15;
2 seconded by Mr. Hess. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.
3

4 *B. Receive and Place on File - FY2014 CCGISC External Audit*
5

6 Ms. Riley noted that external audit is completed and there were no significant findings. A copy of the
7 report has been provided to the Committee for their review.
8

9 Mr. Hess asked if the Consortium has any future plans to invest working capital. Ms. Riley noted that this
10 Committee created a fund balance goal of 25% of the annual operating budget as a safety net. Ms. Busey
11 explained that the fund balance contains collected revenue for the FY2017 orthophotography acquisition
12 project.
13

14 Mr. Hess asked if there are any plans to evaluate where the Consortium would like to be in 5 or 10 years.
15 Ms. Riley noted that she would like to put together a long term technology assessment plan. Mr. Hess
16 agreed and asked if technology expenses are contained within the CCGISC budget or if they are County
17 expenses. Ms. Busey explained that the CCGISC budget is self-contained and a capital plan that is tied in
18 with the budget can provide an overview of anticipated expenses for technology improvements. Ms. Riley
19 noted that demands on their servers are continuing to grow and a plan needs to be implemented and
20 addressed.
21

22 **VI. Business Items**

23 *A. Discussion of Data and Service Hosting Fees for Approval*
24

25 Ms. Riley reported the Consortium has historically allowed affiliated agencies to pay for and use the
26 Consortium server for GIS data storage and distribution. The fee is based on an established cost-share
27 formula supplied to the board in a memo. CUUATS, Champaign Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation
28 Study, recently began utilizing the Consortium server to store and distribute its GIS data. The majority of
29 the Consortium members are also members of CUUATS. This overlap prompted discussions regarding the
30 validity of transferring these costs to CUUATS. Non-overlapping members include the Village of Rantoul
31 and the Village of Mahomet. Ms. Riley recommended that the practice of recovering costs for server
32 usage be applied consistently for all affiliated agencies.
33

34 Ms. Voitik commented that CUUATS is currently operating without a state budget. Since member agencies
35 pay membership fees to both the GIS Consortium and CUUATS, Ms. Voitik noted that any charges placed
36 on CUUATS will ultimately be dispersed back to the member agencies in the CUUATS membership fee.
37

38 Ms. Busey agreed with Ms. Riley's opinion. Ms. Busey noted that utilizing CCGISC server space is an
39 expenditure item for CUUATS to provide their services and it should be reflected in their budget.
40

41 Mr. Kopmann commented that member agencies already pay CCGISC and CUUATS membership fees and
42 noted that paying for server space should already be included with each fee instead of paying twice for the
43 same services. Ms. Busey explained that all CUUATS expenses are included in the CUUATS membership fee.
44 She noted that charging CUUATS for server space will provide savings to the Consortium in the long run
45 because the Consortium will not need to utilize their budget for CUUATS utilization of the server.
46

47 Mr. Passarelli agreed with Ms. Riley and Ms. Busey. He noted that entities who are not members of
48 CUUATS or the Consortium could be subsidized by CUUATS and ultimately they could utilize the server
49 without paying any membership fees. Ms. Voitik noted that the data hosted by CUUATS is for the members
50 of CUUATS who already pay a membership fee.
51
52

1 Mr. Brown asked if the Village of Mahomet is paying a fee for CCGISC to host data specific to Mahomet.
2 Ms. Riley confirmed. Mr. Brown noted that from a budgeting standpoint, it makes sense to charge CUUATS
3 for server usage.
4

5 Mr. Passarelli commented that entities should pay according to their server usage. Ms. Busey explained
6 that the cost of operating the server is split equally across all entities that utilize the server.
7

8 Ms. Riley explained that without charging agencies for the use of the server, CCGISC membership fees
9 would increase due to the amount it would cost CCGISC to operate and maintain the server. She noted that
10 charging each entity for their use of the server helps to offset the overall cost of being a member of the
11 Consortium.
12

13 Mr. Hess noted that a server upgrade may be necessary in the future if demands for storage space
14 continue to increase. Ms. Riley confirmed and noted utilizing a shared server is less expensive than each
15 agency obtaining the necessary hardware and software for their own individual operations.
16

17 Mr. Hess asked what other options are available beside the primary recommendation of charging CUUATS
18 for utilizing server space. Ms. Busey noted that the alternative would be not changing CUUATS. Mr. Hess
19 noted all other members should be allowed free server space if CUUATS is not charged and does not
20 support a policy that supports a single entity.
21

22 Mr. Brown asked for clarification in regards to CUUATS use of server storage and their associated charges.
23 Ms. Riley noted that CUUATS began using the Consortium server several months ago and continues to add
24 data and services to the server.
25

26 Mr. Hess commented that it is not a requirement of CCGISC members to utilize server space. He noted it
27 is an additional service that CCGISC provides and it's justified that members pay more to utilize the server
28 space because it is an additional benefit.
29

30 Mr. Kopmann asked if CCGISC incurs extra charges for the server space used by CUUATS.
31

32 Ms. Riley explained that CCGISC does not incur additional charges at this point. She noted that CUUATS
33 data utilizes about 15% of server space. Ms. Busey commented that demand for server storage will
34 continue to increase in the future as its benefits become more apparent to the members who already
35 utilize the service.
36

37 Mr. Kopmann asked why CUUATS will be charged if there are no additional costs associated with operating
38 the server that has available space. Mr. Hess noted there are additional costs involved in utilizing the
39 server that include additional staff time needed to keep up with the demand put on the infrastructure,
40 maintaining the data and the need to plan for future replacement. Mr. Kopmann noted that entities are
41 already paying for CCGISC membership. Mr. Hess commented that it is an additional service provided by
42 CCGISC to the benefit of individual entities – it is not a county-wide benefit.
43

44 Mr. Kopmann asked if upgrade costs will be due to the additional use by member agencies or because
45 CCGISC will require more server space for their operations. Ms. Riley explained that Consortium staff
46 monitors affiliated usage and cost-sharing fees are based on usage thereby offsetting their portion of any
47 upgrade costs. Ms. Voitik commented that the additional benefit of server space for members has an
48 associated charged because there are intended purposes for using the space. Ms. Busey commented that
49 giving members the option to utilize server space solely because there is space available is dangerous and
50 unsustainable for the County to operate. She noted that without a fee structure in place, member agencies
51 will want as much dedicated space as possible which will in turn require additional servers to be purchased
52 and maintained.
53

1 Mr. Hess asked if a motion is needed to accept Ms. Riley's original recommendation or if the committee
2 should defer to see if CUUATS has an alternate proposal. It was noted that the cost-sharing formula is an
3 established policy - a motion is not needed for business to be conducted as usual.
4

5 Ms. Voitik recommended a motion be made and roll call be taken in order for the minutes to reflect who is
6 for and who is against CUUATS being charged a fee for CCGISC server usage.
7

8 **MOTION** by Mr. Passarelli to approve the CCGISC Director's recommendation to consistently apply the practice of
9 recovering costs for dedicated server space across all entities; seconded by Mr. Hess.
10

11 Upon vote: Aye (4) Hess, Passarelli, Busey, Brown
12 Nay (1) Kopmann
13 Abstain (1) Voitik
14

15 Ms. Voitik noted that she abstained because she does not want to discount the service that is being
16 provided; however, she is conflicted because there is no other alternative to the issue at hand.
17

18 Mr. Passarelli asked if CUUATS has the ability to store data locally rather than using the Consortium
19 infrastructure. Ms. Riley explained that CUUATS currently does not have the proper technology licensing
20 and infrastructure to do so.
21

22 Ms. Voitik changed her vote to Aye after further discussion in regards to licensing issues.
23

24 **MOTION CARRIED.**
25

26 Ms. Voitik recommended giving CUUATS the opportunity to develop an alternative solution to not paying
27 the fee and having the Policy Committee review that alternative option before making a final decision. Mr.
28 Hess asked Ms. Voitik or Ms. Riley to communicate this decision with CUUATS. Ms. Riley and Ms. Voitik
29 confirmed that they will communicate with CUUATS.
30

31 *B. Approval to Recommend Cost Study and GIS Recording Fee Increase to County Board*
32

33 Ms. Riley reported that the County's principal funding source for CCGISC is the GIS Recorder's fee. Due to
34 the decline in the number of recorded documents, the revenue generated by the current fee does not
35 cover the County's portion of the CCGISC membership and orthophotography assessments. Based upon
36 current FY2015 figures, the trend is ongoing. Similar trends have been reported throughout the state
37 resulting in counties increasing GIS recording fees. The GIS recording fee in Champaign County is among
38 the lowest 31% in the state and has not been reviewed in over 10 years.
39

40 Ms. Riley recommended that the CCGISC Policy Committee approve a cost study analysis to assess the
41 justification of an increase in the GIS recording fee to be paid for out of the CCGISC FY2015 budget.
42

43 Ms. Voitik asked if there are fewer types of documents to be recorded and why the number is decreasing.
44 Ms. Busey noted a decrease in the amount real estate transactions.
45

46 Mr. Passarelli asked who conducts the cost study analysis. Ms. Riley explained that an external firm would
47 conduct the study.
48

49 Mr. Hess asked what the committee is being asked to approve. Ms. Busey explained that the cost study will
50 be used to justify an increase to the fee that is deposited into the County's GIS fund, which at this point is
51 completely used for CCGISC. The projected revenue for FY2015 is \$177,000 and typically revenues from the
52 fee are over \$250,000. The county's annual contribution to CCGISC is typically more than \$250,000.
53 Without the analysis, the County is unable to continue contributions at the level it currently provides
54 because the County General Corporate Fund is unable to handle a contribution increase of \$90,000.
55

1 Mr. Passarelli asked if the membership fee for all contributing agencies can be reevaluated in the cost
2 study. Ms. Busey noted that membership contributions can be reconsidered once the cost study is
3 evaluated in regards to raising the GIS recording fee.
4

5 Ms. Riley noted that the current FY2015 budget does not include a line item for the cost study; however, it
6 is anticipated to cost between \$5,000 and \$10,000. Mr. Hess asked Ms. Riley to provide the actual cost of
7 the study before the board approves the cost study. Ms. Busey noted that the motion can include a
8 recommendation that the cost study should not exceed \$10,000.
9

10 Mr. Hess asked why the study needs to be conducted. Ms. Busey explained that in order to increase the fee
11 above the statutory maximum, a cost study needs to be conducted to demonstrate the cost of providing
12 services is greater than the statutory maximum. Mr. Passarelli asked if the study can be conducted
13 internally. Ms. Busey noted that Champaign County does not separate administrative overhead costs
14 between departments. She reported that Bellwether, the company who has conducted cost studies for the
15 County in the past, already has developed formulas for Champaign County departments that take into
16 consideration the unseparated administrative overhead costs that Ms. Riley's staff does not have the
17 expertise to complete. Mr. Hess commented that an external company will complete the job in a faster
18 time frame and with more accuracy.
19

20 Mr. Passarelli asked if Ms. Riley has access to the last cost study for the GIS recording fee. Ms. Riley was
21 unsure when the last cost study was complete and was not sure how formally it was conducted. Ms. Busey
22 noted that the county board will expect a cost study analysis in order to justify the fee increase.
23

24 **MOTION** by Mr. Kopmann to approve the CCGISC Director's recommendation to approve a cost study performed
25 by an outside consultant to assess the justification of an increase in the GIS recording fee in an amount not to
26 exceed \$10,000; seconded by Mr. Hess. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.
27

28 *C. Presentation of FY2016 Budget for Approval*
29

30 Ms. Riley reported that member agency representatives reviewed and prioritized improvement and work
31 plan tasks found in the Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan and Report. A membership increase of 2% is requested
32 for FY2015, which is less than the anticipated 2.5% increase. The proposed Fiscal Year 2016 assessments
33 are for the member agency 2016/2017 budget year. The increase will cover the rising costs of health care,
34 professional services required for the ADA compliance consultant and the proposed 1.5% salary increase.
35

36 **MOTION** by Mr. Hess to approve the FY2016 budget as presented; seconded by Mr. Kopmann. Upon vote, the
37 **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.
38

39 *D. GIS Director's Report*
40

41 • Addressing Initiative

42 CCGISC has started work with the Champaign County Clerk to reconcile the differences in the election
43 database and the centralized address database. The Clerk discussed the option of utilizing the centralized
44 database once the differences are reconciled. Should the Clerk utilize the central database in its election
45 program, the need for member agencies and communities to deliver accurate addressing information will
46 become more critical. Ms. Riley plans to present the Addressing project to the METCAD board in next
47 couple of months.
48

49 • FirstNet Initiative

50 FirstNet, the First Responder Network Authority, is an organization obligated by Congress to take all
51 actions necessary to build, deploy and operate a nationwide public safety broadband network. FirstNet
52 has contacted all County Emergency Management Agencies asking for input in regards to the areas,
53 locations, and infrastructure important to each county. Included in this list is a request for GIS data.
54 CCGISC is working with Champaign County EMA to coordinate this effort.
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

- CCGIS Website and ADA accessibility requirements
CCGIS continue to expand the CCGISC website to support the automation of data sales and data requests. Once completed, CCGISC will notify the ADA consultant that the site is ready for further ADA evaluation. Web site evaluation by an approved consultant is one of the requirements of the County's settlement agreement with the Department of Justice. Once evaluated, any changes or corrections will need to be made.

VII. Adjournment

MOTION by Ms. Busey to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Passarelli. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously. Chair Voitik adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.