

GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes - 4/6/94

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 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
* Steve Henderson	Department of Administrative Services
* Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Surveyor's Office
* Judy Larsen	Dodge County Supervisor
* Jim Merchant	Conservation and Survey Division
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
* 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 30, 1994.

ROLL CALL. The roll was called and 11 individuals were present who were duly authorized to vote and therefore there was a quorum present. Lash Chaffin arrive after the roll call.

MINUTES: Dayle W. moved, Jim M. seconded, that the minutes from the 3/9/94 Str. Cmte. meeting be approved as distributed, providing the date at the top was changed from 3/11/94 to 3/9/94. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote #1 on attached voting record*).

DATA INVENTORY SUBCMTE. Jon O. moved, Dennis B. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. accept the Data Inventory Pilot Project as completed and that the Str. Cmte. commence outreach to populate the online Data Inventory database with meta data information. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote #2 on attached voting record*).

POLICY SUBCMTE. No report other than the Long-Range Planning proposals covered in a later agenda item (Long-range Planning).

TECHNICAL STANDARDS SUBCMTE. No report.

EDUCATION SUBCMTE. Jim M. reported that the April newsletter is out. He noted that there are currently 929 on the mailing list. Jim M. reported that the deadline for articles for the next newsletter is first or second week of June. Jim also reminded people of the Mid-America GIS Symposium coming up on May 2-4 in Kansas City. Jon O. asked if Str. Cmte. members felt that having a tear-off section in the newsletter was a good method to get people to respond to the Data Inventory project. The response was generally affirmative.

GIS REVIEW SUBCMTE. There was no reviews conducted by the Subcmte. since the last Str. Cmte. meeting. Larry Z. did report that Game & Parks was taking the feedback from the Subcmte. seriously and was in the process on conducting an agency-wide review of potential GPS needs.

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND CIVIL DEFENSE. Larry Z. reported that progress had been very slow on the this front. The disaster-related GIS coverages suggested by the ad hoc subcmte. had been forwarded to the Corps for their response on estimated costs to develop and which, if any that they were not interested in developing. Despite several calls by Larry, so far we haven't gotten that information. Larry reported that Terry Kubicek said it looked like the most productive next step was to get together another meeting with the Corps. Dayle W. reported that was similar to his understanding of the current situation.

UPDATE ON NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROCESS.

Municipalities Larry noted that he had reported at the last meeting that Lash C. had sent out needs assessment forms to cities over 5,000. Lash C. also sent out copies of the Technical Standards manual. Lash C. reported that he had sent out about 40 and had received back 10 so far. Lash indicated that he planned to follow up on non-returnees.

Counties Larry reported that since the last meeting, he has worked with Larry Worrell and NACO to get similar materials sent to all County Clerks.

NRDs Larry also reported that Terry Kubicek has sent out similar materials to the NRDs.

Larry also reported that Stan Schmidt, Dept. of Agriculture, had requested that he arrange for a presentation on GIS to some interested staff in their department. Dennis B. offered to help and Dayle W. expressed support for that because DEQ & DOA needed to work together on FIFRA.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING.

Continuation of Reprioritization of Strategic Plan Elements Rod A. gave a brief overview of the reprioritization that the Policy Subcmte. had suggested on the "Priority" Goals and Objectives identified by the Str. Cmte. at last meeting. These Goals and Objectives had been grouped as needing to be done in one of four time frames (**I** - immediate, 3 mths; **S** - short-term, 3-9 mths; **M** - medium-term 9 mths - 2 yrs; and **L** - long-term, 2-5 yrs.) This information had been sent out with the Agenda. Following a brief discussion the Str. Cmte. expressed general support for the timeline categorization.

The Policy Subcmte. had also suggested that instead of focusing on hardware and software needs that it focuses on identifying GIS applications. The thinking was that hardware and software was too specific and that applications would be more meaningful for policy makers. Dennis B. moved, Jon O. seconded, that the Goal 1, Obj. 6, T2, "Identify anticipated long-term hardware and software needs." be replaced on the "Priority" list with Goal 1, Obj. 3, "Identify present and potential Nebraska GIS applications." The motion passed unanimously (*see vote # 3 on the attached voting record*).

Fleshing Out a Picture of Future Nebraska GIS Implementation Rod A. provided an overview of the proposed approach to this area. He noted that Larry had developed, and the Policy Subcmte. reviewed, a series of discussion questions related to each of the consensus points developed a little over a year ago at the all-day retreat. Rod proposed that the Str. Cmte. further define its vision of GIS implementation by discussing at least one page of these questions at each of the next several meetings. Rod proposed that we start with the area of "decentralized, but integrated".

Larry Z. suggested that process-wise, what he would try to do is capture the major points (concepts and tasks) from the discussion and attempt to draft language which captured the essence of the areas of agreement, remaining questions, and task to accomplish. This draft language could be reviewed at the next meeting and serve as a starting place for further discussion. The Str. Cmte. expressed support for this general approach.

The concepts that were discussed are outlined below. Those concepts for which the minute-taker believed general agreement existed among Str. Cmte. members are followed by a (GA).

- ◆ The City of Omaha/Douglas County has similar concerns about how a "decentralized, but integrated" GIS should be implemented and managed. So far their interdepartmental committee has worked fairly well in the area of sharing and communicating needs. Where they have had problems is when one group is doing something that another group feels is in their domain.
- ◆ The discussion noted that as more state agencies implement GIS there will be a need to modify current coordinating structures to include at least the major users. Game & Parks was raised as an example. Two possible responses were discussed. One was seeking to amend current statutes to specifically incorporate new state agencies or to allow for more flexibility with Str. Cmte. membership. The other was to create an additional subcmte. with the specific function of facilitating coordination on GIS among state agencies. This discussion did not reach a conclusion. It was suggested that "Potential changes to legislated structure." is one topic that should be addressed further.
- ◆ The discussion started the process of addressing what was required to move from a centralized mainframe environment for storing and manipulating data to a decentralized PC/workstation-based environment. The discussion of this general topic was not completed, as it evolved into an in-depth discussion of data quality assurance. However, the following major points were raised on the general topic:
 - Requires the ability to ship information electronically (GA).
 - The Online Data Inventory is a significant first step (GA).
 - We already have a defacto "decentralized" system, the challenge is how do we systematically insure its "integration" (GA). The difference between data integration and network integration was also noted.
 - The assurance (or communication) of data quality is perhaps the main obstacle to the successful implementation of a "decentralized, but integrated" GIS (GA).
- ◆ The following points were raised as part of an in-depth discussion of how data quality assurance could be maintained and communicated in decentralized GIS environment.
 - Communication plays a vital role in assuring data quality. On one level, communication among the GIS user community regarding the overall importance maintaining and communicating data quality must be a high priority (GA). On another level, facilitating the communication of the actual quality of specific data must also be a Str. Cmte. priority (GA). The Online Data Inventory and/or publishing a listing of available data (including metadata on quality) are ways to facilitate sharing this information on quality.
 - Standards can play a role in data quality assurance and the current technical standards should be further defined in this area (GA). However, it was acknowledged that defining standards on data quality is difficult.
 - Systematic communication of the specifics of how data was developed or obtained and the developers best estimate of its accuracy is one promising approach to data quality assurance, in a decentralized GIS environment (GA). Clear standards for communicating this information as part of the metadata is one method to facilitate its communication (GA).
 - A standard, high quality base map provides an important foundation for the development of accurate, compatible GIS coverages.
 - Coordination in data development efforts also plays a role in data quality assurance (GA). On-going interagency, joint planning efforts related to database development provide a means to communicate specific database needs and insure that the needed quality is achieved (GA). Such coordination would also provide means to develop and encourage the use of common labeling nomenclature, etc. (GA).
 - Incentives, in a variety of forms, are needed to encourage the documentation and communication of data quality (GA). It is usually not in the short-term, narrowly defined self-interest of the average GIS data developer to commit the extra time and effort to document and communicate the accuracy of data they have developed (GA). \$\$\$, its presence or absence, is the ultimate incentive.

- The GIS Review Subcmte. could help provide an incentive for coordination on data development by including data development in its area of review. No decision was made on the merits of this.
- Focusing data development initiatives at the organization needing the highest level of accuracy promotes overall data accuracy (GA). In the case of the City of Omaha, that was the Public Works Department. In the case of the State of Nebraska, that is local government, and more specifically probably county assessors (GA).
- ♦ The merits of data development initiatives focused on local government.
 - In general, local government has need for data with higher spatial accuracy than does state government (GA). Therefore data developed to meet local government spatial accuracy requirements would likely meet state government spatial accuracy requirements (GA).
 - The assessed value of land involves many of the characteristics desired in standard GIS coverages: area, soils, wells, shape, access to roads, improvements, slope, land cover/use, zoning, etc. (GA).
 - There are a range of incentives that could be considered to encourage and facilitate local government to develop geo-referenced datasets. Those discussed included the Wisconsin model which provides for cash incentives based on a dedicated fee on land transactions. Another incentive discussed was the Kansas statute that requires the Revenue Dept. to provide base maps for counties — they are considering DOQQs for that purpose.
 - It was noted that there is a basis in state statute for requiring counties to develop cadastral maps.

77-1301.04. Reappraisal of lands and improvements; adoption of cadastral map and parcel numbering system; rules. *The Tax Commissioner may require the adoption in connection with any reappraisal, of a cadastral map and parcel numbering system and by rule adopt standards therefor.*

77-1301.13. Joint reappraisal; agreement; contents. (1) *The agreement for reappraisal shall be such as to assure the determination of actual values on a consistent basis in accordance with sections 77-112 and 77-201.*

(2) *The agreement shall contain at least the following provisions: ...*

(f) *That a cadastral map and parcel numbering system pursuant to section 77-1301.04 be adopted....*

77-1329. Tax maps; county assessor; maintain. *The Tax Commissioner shall require each county assessor to maintain tax maps in accordance with standards specified by the Tax Commissioner. Whenever necessary to correct mapping deficiencies, the Tax Commissioner shall install standard maps or approve mapping plans and supervise map production. The Tax Commissioner may require the county to reimburse the state for tax maps installed.*

AGENCY UPDATES ON GIS ACTIVITIES: Dennis B. reported that DEQ had worked with staff from the Oil and Gas Commission to address-match some of their files and share approaches to geo-referencing wells. Dennis B. also reported that DEQ had available a Tremble Pathfinder GPS unit for temporary loan to another state agency. Duane S. reported that Scotts Bluff County had developed a Data Guide to guide the distribute of county geo-referenced data. Dayle W. reported that NRC has almost completed their ice jam study.

OTHER BUSINESS: Larry shared the current draft of the GIS Needs Assessment Report he is conducting for Game and Parks and asked Str. Cmte. members to review the draft and provide him with feedback.

Executive Session. Rod A. moved, Dayle W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. go into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters. The motion carried unanimously (*see vote # 4 on attached Voting Record*). Following the vote, everyone except the participants who were authorized to vote left the room.

Following the conclusion of the Executive Session, Jon O. moved, Dennis W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. pay Larry Z's expenses to the Mid-America GIS Symposium in Kansas City on May 2-4, 1994. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote #5 on attached Voting Record*).

Next Meeting. The Str. Cmte. decided to hold its May meeting in the East Campus Union on May 18th at 1:30 p.m. The Str. Cmte. also decided to select meeting dates for the next year at the May meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the Str. Cmte. Chair Rod Armstrong adjourned the meeting.

TO DO LIST:

Everyone - Review the first two pages of concept questions related to (1) implementing a decentralized, but integrated GIS and (2) database development and provide Larry Z. with written comments by 4/20/94.

Jon Ogden and Data Inventory Subcmte. - proceed with outreach efforts to populate the Online Data Inventory System.

Lash Chaffin - follow up with municipalities on GIS Needs Assessment.

Dennis Burling & Larry Zink - arrange for a GIS presentation at the Dept. of Agriculture.

"Those wonderful & willing souls" - review Larry's incomplete draft of the Game and Parks GIS Needs Assessment and provide him with feedback.

Larry Z. - compile the responses to the local government needs assessment survey.

GIS Steering Committee
VOTING RECORD

Date 4/6/94

Attendance Minutes Data GIS Exec. LZ
#1 #2 #3 #4 #5
Inv. Application Session Exp.

DAS - Steve Henderson

P

+

+

DEQ - Tom Lamberson

P

+

+

Dennis Burling

+

+

+

CSD - Perry Wigley

P

+

+

Les Howard, Jim Merchant

+

+

+

NRC Dayle Williamson

P

+

+

Terry Kubicek

+

+

+

PRO - Rod Armstrong

P

+

+

+

+

+

DOR - Jon Ogden

P

+

+

+

+

+

Surveyor - Jim Brown

P

+

+

+

+

+

LRD - Laura Valenziano

A

John Miyoshi

A

Blaine Dinwiddie

A

Judy Larsen

P

+

+

+

+

+

Larry Worrell

P

+

+

+

+

+

Jim Langtry

Lash Chaffin

P

A

+

+

+

Duane Stott

P

+

+

+

+

+

Dennis Wilson

P

+

+

+

+

+

TOTALS

12

11 (+)

11 (+)

11 (+)

11 (+)

11 (+)

P = present

A = absent

"+" = voting for

"—" = voting against

"NV" = not voting

\\larry\vote\recrd