The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by the Chair, Rod Armstrong.

Present were (* authorized to vote):

* Rod Armstrong	Governor's Policy Research Office
Mahendra Bansal	Natural Resource Commission
* Jim Brown	State Surveyor's Office
* Dennis Burling	Department of Environmental Quality
* Lash Chaffin	League of Municipalities
* Blaine Dinwiddie	Omaha Public Power District
Amy Garwood	Nebraska Library Commission
* Steve Henderson	Department of Administrative Services
* Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
* Jim Merchant	Conservation and Survey Division
* John Miyoshi	Lower Platte NRD
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
* Cliff Welsh	Keith County Commissioner
* Dayle Williamson	Natural Resources Commission
* Dennis Wilson	City of Omaha
Larry K. Zink	Coordinator, GIS Steering Cmte.

NOTICE OF MEETING. A public notice of the meeting pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R.S. 1943, was published in the Omaha World Herald on March 25, 1995.

SPECIAL PLANNING MEETING AGENDA. Str. Cmte. Chair Rod A. opened the meeting by noting that this was a special meeting of the GIS Str. Cmte. called to focus on long-term planning questions, in a setting separate from the normal Str. Cmte. meeting agendas. Rod A. suggested that the Str. Cmte. begin by considering a proposed agenda for the afternoon.

I. Review of Meeting's Proposed Agenda
II. Stepping Back to Examine Our Broad Goals
III. Reviewing Intermediate Projects Currently on the Table
IV. Prioritizing Intermediate Projects
V. Moving from the Intermediate Projects to Developing a Plan for Achieving Our Long-Term Goals

In a brief discussion, the Str. Cmte. indicated their support for the proposed planning agenda. Rod A. introduced Amy Garwood, a consultant working with the Nebraska Library Commission who had agreed to help the Str. Cmte. facilitate this planning session.

STEPPING BACK TO EXAMINE OUR BROAD GOALS. Rod A. suggested that the Str. Cmte. might consider a framework that the Kansas GIS Policy Board has used to outline their goals and initiatives, as a way to take a fresh look at the Str. Cmte.'s goals and objectives. That framework consists of four "tracks": Database Track, Services Track; Technology Transfer Track; and Management Track (brief description attached to these minutes).

Services and Technology Transfer Tracks. The limited discussion of the Services and Technology Transfer Tracks noted that the Online GIS Inventory was a component of the Services Track, and potentially efforts in the area of metadata training and GIS planning and implementation assistance. It was suggested that the description of the Technology Transfer Track should be modified to refer to not only state agencies, but also local governments. There was some discussion of the merits of combining these two categories.

Management Track. It was suggested by some that the Legislature needed to provide the Str. Cmte. clearer authority relative to state agency's GIS development and their database development. Jim B. stimulated the discussion by with a suggestion that maybe the Str. Cmte. needed to revisit its earlier decision to pursue a "decentralized, but integrated" approach versus a "centralized" approach. Jim B. noted that while he initially supported the concept of the decentralized approach, he wasn't sure, given our experience so far, that the Str. Cmte. was going to be able to achieve integration through a voluntary, cooperative approach. While noting their general agreement with a decentralized approach, several members also noted that it would be very difficult to move to a centralized model now, given the current dispersion of the technology among state agencies.

While acknowledging the difficulty, successes such as the cooperative work between DEQ and the Fire Marshall were noted. It was suggested by some that the Str. Cmte. had not been assertive enough to determine how workable a decentralized, but integrated approach really was. Steve H. suggested that before the Str. Cmte. considers alternative models, the Str. Cmte. should seriously attempt to tackle some of the tough issues, such as initiatives directed at coordinated development of core spatial databases. It was suggested by someone, that a sustained effort in this area might now be feasible given the completion of the assessment of state agencies' GIS needs and plans (at the Legislature's request) and the possibility of the Legislature providing stable staff support for the Str. Cmte.'s efforts.

The need to clarify and coordinate interagency management efforts was raised by some members. Dennis B. raised the question of potentially overlapping roles of the GIS Str. Cmte. and NIDCAC in the coordination of database development. It was noted by others that the GIS Str. Cmte. was created out of NIDCAC because of the felt need to have a specific body to coordinate this specialized area. Dayle W. raised a concern that state agency Directors needed clarification relative to the various review procedures that they need to go through to purchase hardware and software. It was noted that in the area of the GIS review procedure, there was an apparent overlap between the GIS Review procedure and the developing information technology review procedures. Rod A. indicated that he felt many of these concerns were a reflection of an interim transition phase in which the administration and Legislature were putting in place management structures for this broad area. Rod noted his belief that the proposals currently before the Legislature, if enacted, will help to clarify and facilitate oversight and coordination roles. Staff support would be provided to the GIS Str. Cmte., with a focus on spatial data coordination. The information technology planning process would focus on planning and coordination of the hardware and communications component.

Database Track. Much of the discussion in the initial section of the planning agenda focused on the database track. It was noted that the Str. Cmte. had decided in the process it used to outline a long-term conceptual GIS development model, that spatial data development should be the major focus of the Str. Cmte.'s effort. It was also noted that while it had been determined that this area should be a major focus of the Str. Cmte.'s efforts, that no subcmte. exists to realize this focus. The discussion noted that it was not, at this time, the role of the Str. Cmte. to actually produce spatial data, but instead to facilitate the process by bringing interested parties together to develop proposals for getting needed spatial data developed. It was also noted that a significant role of the Str. Cmte. was to make determinations/recommendations on the relative priority of various spatial databases for development.

The model that had sketched out in the "Where Do We Focus Our Resources Now?" handout of creating an "Ad Hoc Task Forces on Each Category of Spatial Data Identified as a Priority" was suggested as a model the Str. Cmte. should follow. It was suggested that such task forces should bring together the interested parties, assess current data needs and plans, develop standards, and outline alternatives for achieving the needed data development. The question was raised about how local governments would receive state identified database standards. It was noted by some local government representatives, that in general standards developed in advance are usually perceived as helpful because the local government does not then have to do that work. The importance of involving local governments in the ad hoc task forces was highlighted. Another suggested foci, in the area of databases, was the facilitation of the integration of existing databases, such as water wells.

REVIEWING INTERMEDIATE PROJECTS CURRENTLY ON THE TABLE. To start off the second phase of the planning agenda, Larry Z. gave a brief overview of the projects or initiatives that he had compiled based previous Str. Cmte. discussions. These had been made available to the Str. Cmte. prior to the meeting in a document entitled, "Where Do We Focus Our Resources Now?" Larry invited questions or suggestions as he reviewed the list. Larry noted that some of the items are on the list primarily to remind the Str. Cmte. that it has made commitments to them already (D, G, and H) and therefore they need to be considered as its allocated resources. Following this brief overview, Larry Z. invited Str. Cmte. to suggest additions to this list of intermediate projects. The one addition which was suggested was "M. Defining roles between GIS Str. Cmte., NIDCAC, and the information technology planning effort." It was also suggested that initiative (L) be modified to focus on government officials and representatives in general and not just local ones.

Member discussion followed to clarify the initiatives and to share perspectives on the relative merits of the various initiatives. Members were then asked to indicate their views regarding the relative priority of the listed initiatives. Each member was given five dots to use in some manner to indicate their priorities (5 on one initiative, 1 on five different initiatives, etc.). For the purposes of this exercise, it was decided to not rank initiatives A, D, and H. *The total dots members given each of the initiatives are shown in the first column in the list above.*

	A.	Update Strategic Action Plan
3 -	B.	Statewide Emergency Planning and Response GIS Needs Assessment and Planning
13 -	C.	Local Government Land Records Modernization and GIS Development
	D.	GIS Conference/Symposium
19 -	E.	Ad Hoc Task Forces on Each Category of Spatial Data Identified as a Priority
4 -	F.	Pilot Demonstration Project to Explore and Develop Applications and Coverages from Existing DOQQs for Saunders County.
2 -	G.	Enhancement of Online Spatial Data Catalog
	H	Work with Conservation and Survey Division and AIM on their project to explore the possibilities of using broad-band multimedia to access and display spatial data for policy-makers and the general public.
4 -	I.	Work with NIDCAC to explore and pursue enhanced coordination of existing, overlapping data bases to facilitate data sharing possibilities.
2 -	J.	Explore and develop the Str. Cmte's relationship to existing federal spatial data coordination efforts
1 -	K.	Work with state and local agencies to explore how adopted metadata standards should best be applied and implemented.
13 -	L.	Major educational effort focused on ~~local~~ government officials and representatives.
7 -	M.	Defining roles between GIS Str. Cmte., NIDCAC, and the information technology planning effort.

The results of the straw poll, via dots, indicated a strong consensus/majority for three initiatives (C, E, and L). It was noted that there was a relatively sharp divide between those three initiatives and the other proposed initiatives. It was also noted that those three initiatives were very interrelated and complimentary.

The discussion turned to the initiative the Str. Cmte. rated as its highest priority — "Ad Hoc Tasks Forces on Priority Spatial Data Categories." It was decided that the Str. Cmte. should start out with task forces on only two or three spatial data categories. The members were clear that this did not imply that the other categories should not also be pursued, but that it was a reflection of limited resources and a hope that we might learn from our initial efforts. Larry Z. outlined the spatial data categories that the Str. Cmte. had selected several months ago as priorities (listed below). Following discussion, it was decided to break out and list separately the Public Land Survey System (PLSS) from the cadastre data; flood plains from the waterways and waterbodies category; and contours/topo quads from the DOQQs. The member then sought to the identifying those priority spatial data categories which should receive initial attention. *Again five dots were issued to each member. The number of votes each category received are again listed in the fist column.*

13 -	Multipurpose cadastres		
10 -	PLSS		
9 -	Soils	-	5
8 -	DOQQs	-	5
8 -	Political boundaries	-	0
5 -	Contours/topo quads	-	1
2 -	Infrastructure facilities	-	2
2 -	Land Cover/Use	-	2
2 -	Flood plains	-	1
0 -	Waterways and waterbodies		1

The results showed a strong support for an initial focus on multipurpose cadastres and PLSS. The following discussion revealed that most members felt that cadastres and PLSS could easily be combined into the same ad hoc task force for at least the initial research and proposal development phase. To attempt to identify one more data category for an initial ad hoc task force each member was given three dots. The results of this straw poll showed a tie between Soils and DOQQ. In an attempt to explore the results, members were asked if they only had one vote which would they choose. The overwhelming vote was for Soils. It was decided then to initially pull together one ad hoc task force on Cadastres/PLSS and one on Soils.

MOVING FROM THE INTERMEDIATE PROJECTS TO DEVELOPING A PLAN FOR ACHIEVING OUR LONG-TERM GOALS. At this point in the meeting, there was not a lot of energy for further efforts to lay out a blueprint for developing a more comprehensive plan for the next several years. It was decided that in the next Str. Cmte. meeting, a major agenda item should be defining the charge that the Str. Cmte. should give these ad hoc task forces.

Members were encouraged to submit suggestions to Larry Z. prior to the April 19th Str. Cmte. meeting. Suggestions for groups or individuals who should be part of the two task forces would also be helpful. It was noted that Larry Z. had started this process on his "Where Do We Focus Our Resources Now?" handout. Under "Ad Hoc Task Forces on Each Category of Spatial Data Identified as a Priority", Larry Z. had listed the following possible charges.

1. Identify current status and plans for development
2. Identify interested agencies and organizations
3. Identify overlapping and special needs related to data theme
4. Develop standards and/or guidelines for specific spatial data base development efforts
5. Identify possibilities for partnerships in data development efforts
6. Identify impediments to development
7. Develop proposals: including timelines, lead agencies, partnerships, and needs related to the development of priority spatial data.

It was suggested that perhaps the Policy Subcmte. could do some further advance work on this matter. Cliff W. expressed an interest in participating in those meeting, but wondered if there was some way to hold them on the same day as the Str. Cmte. meeting so that he didn't need to travel of Lincoln twice a month. It was decided to try starting the Str. Cmte. meeting at 10:00 am and then break for the Forum and then reconvene at 1:30.

TO DO LIST:

All Str. Cmte. members are encouraged to submit suggestions to Larry Z. on the scope of the charges to be given to the two ad hoc tasks forces on cadastre database development and soils database development, prior to the April 19th Str. Cmte. meeting. Suggestions for groups or individuals who should be part of the two task forces would also be helpful (see above).