GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes - 4/19/95

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by the Acting Chair, Jon Ogden.

Present were (* authorized to vote):

* Rod Armstrong	Governor's Policy Research Office
Mahendra Bansal	Natural Resource Commission
* Dennis Burling	Department of Environmental Quality
* Blaine Dinwiddie	Omaha Public Power District
* Steve Henderson	Department of Administrative Services
Les Howard	Conservation and Survey Division
Terry Kubicek	Natural Resources Commission
Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
* Jim Merchant	Conservation and Survey Division
* John Miyoshi	Lower Platte NRD
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
Tim Prescott	Natural Resources Conservation Service
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
* Cliff Welsh	Keith County Commissioner
* Dennis Wilson	City of Omaha
* Larry Worrell	Lancaster County Surveyor
Paul Yamamoto	Department of Environmental Quality
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 April 12, 1995.

ROLL CALL. Acting Chair Jon Ogden called the meeting to order at approximately 1:15 pm and requested that Larry Z. call the roll. Ten duly authorized representatives were present and therefore a quorum was present to conduct business. Chair Rod Armstrong and Steve H. arrived later in the meeting.

MINUTES: Jim M. moved, Dennis W. seconded, that the minutes of the March 8, 1995, and March 23, 1995, GIS Str. Cmte. meetings be approved as distributed. Two modifications to the minutes were offered and accepted as friendly amendments to the minutes and the motion. The first was that Paul Yamamoto, DEQ, attended both meetings and the second was that the minutes of the March 23rd meeting had the incorrect heading date of March 28th. The motion passed unanimously as amended *(see the attached Voting Record sheet, vote # 1).*

MOVING AHEAD ON PRIORITY PROGRAM OBJECTIVES. Cadastre/PLSS Ad Hoc Task Force. Many of the same people present for the formal meeting had also be present in the morning for approximately an hour and half informal discussion of how best to build on the decisions reached at the March 23rd planning meeting. Most of this discussion focused on how best to proceed with the proposed ad hoc task force on cadastre/Public Land Survey System. No formal action was taken during this morning session. Larry Z. and Jim B. had prepared a list of twelve questions for the Str. Cmte. to consider as possible charges to the ad hoc task force.

Based on the morning discussion, Jon O. and Blaine Dinwiddie had developed draft language for an ad hoc task force charge. Jon O. moved, Blaine D. seconded, that a task force of up to nine members be formed to address the following issues:

1) The definition of a "base map" to include the PLSS and cadastre information.

2) A process, including estimates of cost & effort, to create, maintain, and share the information contained in the "base map". The process should also address the utilization of existing information and how to incorporate enhancements to reach a desired accuracy. The task force should consider the questions prepared by Jim Brown and Larry Zink *(see attached)*.

The task force will report the results of its effort to the GIS Steering Committee at its July 1995 meeting. Possible membership of the task force should be individuals from the: State Surveyor's Office, County Surveyors, Legislative liaisons, County Commissioners, Register of Deeds, County Assessors, Dept. of Revenue, and representatives from two other state agencies.

Terry K. moved to amend the motion that state agencies be specifically named or that they could volunteer. Terry volunteered the interest of NRC's participation in the ad hoc task force. The movers of the motion accepted NRC's participation as a friendly amendment with the other state agency representation being left to those forming the ad hoc task force. Subsequent discussion later in the meeting clarified that the responsibility for forming and chairing the task force was given to Jim Brown, State Surveyor. The motion passed with nine voting "for", one voting "against" and one "not voting" *(see Voting Record sheet, vote # 2)*.

Soils Ad Hoc Task Force. Larry Z. reported on meetings which he had arranged since the Str. Cmte. planning meeting on March 23rd. Larry Z. reported that he had meet with representatives of the three major agencies involved in developing soils data for the state of Nebraska: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS, formerly SCS), Natural Resources Commission (NRC), and Conservation and Survey Division (CSD). Based on those meetings, Larry Z. reported that while there are a number of issues to be resolved between these three agencies, personality problems seemed to be a major problem that was making it difficult to get these other issues resolved and therefore enable the three agencies to work more closely together. Other significant issues include how best to relate to the draft SSURGO standards for digital county soils data, and which agency should do what work in the overall process of developing the digital soils data.. Larry Z. reported that the three agencies had held two or three meetings in an attempt to resolve some of these questions and that another meeting was scheduled for the first of May.

It was Larry Z's recommendation to the Str. Cmte. that it was perhaps not timely to form an ad hoc task force and interject another body into these discussions/negotiations. Larry Z. did report however that most of the people he had spoken to had expressed an appreciation of the Str. Cmte.'s interest and the contact from him. Larry Z. noted that Norm Helzer, NRCS State Soil Scientist, had offered to put on the agenda of the next meeting of the three agencies, a list of questions from the Str. Cmte. to see if the agencies felt it would be helpful to give their unique perspectives on those questions. Larry Z. noted that in response to that offer, he had drafted a list of four questions, based on his meetings with the agency representatives, which he felt might be helpful *(see attached)*.

Terry K. stated his belief that the Str. Cmte. should not get involved in the current discussion related to the development of digital soils data. He suggested that the Str. Cmte.'s record did not point to its ability to help facilitate this problem. Terry K. suggested that best approach for the Str. Cmte. was to name a lead agency for developing digital soils data and hold them accountable for getting it done.

Terry K. moved, Cliff W. seconded, that the GIS Str. Cmte. endorse NRC as the lead agency in developing digital soils data and DOQQs for the state of Nebraska.

Jim M. expressed his opposition to the motion and his concern that the situation involved with the development of digital soils data was much more complicated that had been presented to the Str. Cmte. so far. Jim M. noted that at best it was premature for the Str. Cmte. to take this step before it educated itself more fully on the issues involved and hear the perspectives of the other parties involved. Jim M. noted that he felt there was productive and necessary roles for all of the parties in achieving the desired end. Larry Z. also noted that he felt it was premature to be making this decision without more fully examining the issues involved. Larry Z. noted that endorsing one agency as the lead agency would likely indirectly involve a decision on the best approach for achieve SSURGO standards for county soils data. Larry Z. stated that the Str. Cmte. was discussing an issue that potentially could involve millions of dollars and that supporting the expenditure of these scarce resources in one area could adversely impact other data development priorities, and that discussions related to how to get the best overall result from scare resources was one of the issues under discussion. Following extended discussion, Jon O. called the question. It was noted that there needed to be a vote on calling the question. Larry Z. polled the Str. Cmte. members and ten supported the calling of the question and one opposed *(see the attached Voting Record Sheet, vote #3)*.

The question being called, the Str. Cmte. voted on Terry K's motion to name NRC as the lead agency for the development of digital soils data and DOQQs for Nebraska. The motion failed to pass, with six voting "for" and five voting "against" *(Str. Cmte. procedure requires a minimum of eight votes to pass a motion) (see the attached Voting Record sheet, vote #4)*.

The discussion that followed highlighted the desire of the Str. Cmte. to facilitate movement in area of digital county soil data and their desire to hear the perspectives of the other two agencies involved in the development of digital county soils data. Larry Z. suggested that another possibility to explore was to invite the three agencies to a Str. Cmte. meeting to present their perspectives on how digital county soils data should be achieved. There was general support for this idea from the Str. Cmte. Tim Prescott, NRCS, was asked if he felt this would be acceptable for NRCS and he indicated that he could not make a commitment, but that he was willing to pursue the question with agency management. Larry Z. was charged with inviting representatives of the three agencies to present their perspectives and/or plans for developing digital county soils data for Nebraska. It was suggested that Larry's draft questions could be shared with the agencies as being reflective of the type of information the Str. Cmte. was interested in knowing and that the agencies should also be informed that the Str. Cmte. was considering the possibility of naming a lead state agency for digitizing county soils data. It was also suggested that Larry's draft questions be modified to specifically refer to vector data and to mention SSURGO standards.

Chair Rod A. suggested that in the interest of moving along with the other items on the agenda that effort to further define the priority concerns of "Local Government Land Records Modernization and GIS Development" and "Major educational effort focused on government officials and representatives" should be deferred to a latter meeting. This proposal was supported by Str. Cmte. members.

GIS REVIEW SUBCMTE. Proposed Refinements of Review Procedures. Based on discussion by the GIS Review Subcmte., Larry Z. had drafted and mailed out with the agenda draft language related to refinement of review procedures in the following three areas: Repetitive Reviews; GIS Review Subcmte Membership and Voting; and GIS Initiative and/or Project Review and Action. Jon O. moved, Blaine D. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. adopt as policy all three proposals as drafted *(draft language repeated below)*.

<u>Repetitive Reviews</u>. Through mutual consent with CDP, the GIS Str. Cmte. may define hardware and software guidelines and thresholds, whereby relatively low-cost, repetitive hardware and software purchases requests would not require repetitive reviews by the GIS Review Subcmte. and the GIS Steering Committee. The GIS Str. Cmte. has the option, as it reviews a specific agency's purchase request, to outline a general policy or guideline related to future purchase requests for the same hardware or software. Such general policy guidelines should clearly identify the hardware and/or software for which the GIS Str. Cmte. determines future reviews are no longer necessary. Such guidelines may also note extenuating circumstances which should be considered in determining whether a formal review is warranted. Such extenuating circumstances may include factors such as the overall costs, the number of units to be purchased, and how the proposed purchase relates to the purchasing agency's current GIS capability. (For example: The GIS Steering Committee recommends approval of purchase requests for three or fewer copies of ArcView 2 software for any state agency which already has existing GIS capability and the Steering Committee does not feel that such purchase requests require further review and action by the GIS Steering Committee.)

If the GIS Steering Committee has adopted a general policy or guideline related to a specific type of hardware or software, future purchases requests for that specific type of hardware or software could be handled administratively by one of three options.
1. CDP acts on the GIS Steering Committees general policy or guideline and therefore does not refer the purchase request to the GIS Steering Committee.
2. CDP refers the purchase request to the Steering Committee and the Steering Committee's Coordinator (consulting with Review Subcmte. members as necessary) returns the referral to CDP with a recommendation for approval based on the general policy or guideline adopted by the GIS Steering Committee.
3. CDP refers the purchase request to the Steering Committee and the GIS Review Subcmte. (either via in person meeting or phone calls) determines that the purchase requests falls within the previously adopted general policy or guidelines and therefore instructs the Coordinator to return a recommendation for approval based on the GIS Steering Committee general policy or guideline.

<u>GIS Review Subcmte. Membership and Voting</u>. The GIS Review Subcmte. shall consist of four members. A minimum of three votes in favor will be required to make any formal recommendation to the GIS Steering Committee. In cases in which one or more members may have a potential conflict of interest in a specific request to be reviewed, that member(s) shall not vote on the purchase request review recommendation. The CDP representative who forwarded the review request shall make determinations of potential conflicts of interests. An individual Subcmte. member may also make such a determination for themselves.

<u>GIS Initiative and/or Project Review and Action</u>. To facilitate interagency and intergovernmental coordination, all GIS and digital geo-spatial data users in Nebraska are urged to bring pending GIS-related development projects and/or initiatives to the attention of the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee. Such initiatives should be presented to the Steering Committee in a manner which is both sufficiently timely and detailed to enable the Steering Committee to consider how other GIS or digital geo-spatial data needs might be integrated with the pending initiative and how the pending initiative impacts other GIS and geo-spatial data development goals and objectives. Given the Nebraska Legislature's expressed intention that the GIS Steering Committee should coordinate these activities among state agencies, such timely notification by state agencies is particularly important.

In response, the GIS Steering Committee has an obligation to the agency or entity which notifies them of pending initiatives to provide that entity with prompt and clear feedback. To facilitate this prompt and clear feedback, the Steering Committee should establish a procedural policy to provide at least initial feedback to the initiating entity within no more than two Steering Committee meetings following the initial notification. Such feedback should indicate (as the Steering Committee deems appropriate) the Steering Committee's general or specific support for the initiative (or lack thereof); concerns; suggestions which might enhance the initiative; requests for further information; requests for further consultation as the initiative progresses; and/or details of planned Steering Committee actions related to the proposed initiative.

Prior to voting, Larry Z. noted that there had been some confusion regarding the three options outlined in the Repetitive Review proposal. Some had interpreted them to be that we were going to choose one of them and others had interpreted them to imply that all three options were available to CDP and the Subcmte. depending on which they considered most appropriate. The resultant discussion clarified that it was the intent of the motion to have all three options available. The motion passed unanimously *(see attached Voting Record sheet, vote # 5)*.

<u>Civil Defense's printers and Softrisk software and training</u>. Larry Z. noted that this item involved two separate purchase requests. The one for printers, the Review Subcmte. had discussed in its meeting and recommended approval. The one for the Softrisk software and training had been circulated to the Review Subcmte. members, but no meeting had been held due to time constraints. NRC had raised questions about the number of software licenses required and Jim Brown had concerns about the relationship between the two requests and the continue development of GIS capability by the agency without a study or plan for GIS's role in emergency preparedness within Civil Defense. However, individually all members of the Review Subcmte. recommended approval of the Softrisk purchase request. Larry Z. also noted that Sue Krogman, Civil Defense, was not able to attend the Str. Cmte. meeting due to a prior commitment and that she expressed a desire if necessary to postpone consideration of the purchase request until she could meet with the Str. Cmte. or Review Subcmte. to discuss any concerns. Following a brief discussion, Terry K. moved, and it was seconded, that the Str. Cmte. recommend approval of both purchase requests (#95-145 and #95-172). The motion passed with eleven voting "for" and Steve H. "not voting" *(see attached Voting Record sheet, vote #6)*.

<u>Natural Resources Commission's hardware and software</u>. Jon O. reported to the Str. Cmte. that the GIS Review Subcmte. had voted to recommended approval of NRC's purchase requests based primarily on the agency's reported need to replace existing Digital Ultrix equipment because ArcInfo support will apparently no longer be available for the Ultrix platform after two years. Jon O. noted that the DOQQ pilot project issue which was mentioned in the purchase request was treated separately by another motion of the Subcmte. Jon O. moved, Dennis W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. recommend approval of the two NRC purchase requests (#106-M and #107-M). The motion passed with eleven voting "for" and Steve H. "not voting" *(see attached Voting Record sheet, vote #7)*.

<u>Natural Resources Commission's DOQQ production</u>. As noted above, the Review Subcmte. had separated the issue of the hardware and software request from the DOQQ pilot project referred to in the purchase request. The Subcmte had passed the following motion, "...that the GIS Str. Cmte. investigate the DOQQ pilot project in Lancaster County for the purpose of determining its compatibility with the Str. Cmte.'s long-range goals; to identify methods of enhancing the pilot project products utility for realizing those long-range goals; and to identify the Str. Cmte.'s role in the pilot project." Questions were raised about the reason the Review Subcmte. was considering this policy issue. Larry Z. noted that the last time (2/9/94) the Str. Cmte. addressed this issue they charged the

Review Subcmte. with considering both the technical and policy implications of an item referred to them for review. Several members expressed support for the pilot project and its potential to determine the feasibility and costs of developing DOQQS in-house. Support was also expressed for the importance of the Str. Cmte. actively considering the implications of major data development initiatives by state agencies. Concern was expressed that more could have been done to inform and seek input from the Str. Cmte. prior to NRC entering into its contractual arrangement with USGS. The Str. Cmte. did not take any formal action on the NRC DOQQ pilot project, expressing general support for the effort, with the understanding that NRC will provide a written report to the Str. Cmte. of its findings and their implications for future DOQQ development.

DATA INVENTORY SUBCMTE. No report.

POLICY SUBCMTE. No report.

TECHNICAL STANDARDS SUBCMTE. No report.

EDUCATION SUBCMTE. Jim M. noted that the April newsletter is almost ready to go.

GPS COORDINATION SUBCMTE. Terry K. requested of Jon O. that he express to Jerry Odum, NRC's continuing interest in being included in HARN meeting and discussions. Jon O. indicated that he would convey that message.

UPDATE ON THE AIM-MAP PROJECT. Larry Z. reminded the Str. Cmte. that this project continues to take a significant portion of his time, as per the understanding when the decision was made to approve his involvement.

STR. CMTE. MEMBERS UPDATES ON THEIR AGENCY GIS ACTIVITIES. Jon O. mentioned that DOR has entered into a contractual agreement with the Intergraph Corp. to doing early research and development work on a safety management system.

OTHER BUSINESS. Larry Z. asked the Str. Cmte. how they wanted to handle future meeting, i.e. did they want to repeat the effort made for this time to meet earlier and thereby allow those who travel considerable distances to participate in discussions which might otherwise be referred to the Policy Subcmte. Both Cliff W. and Duane S. expressed their support for that approach. It was decided to try it for the next two meetings. The next meeting, May 17th, will convene at 10:00 am and it was felt this extra time would be useful if presentation were available from the three agencies on soils digitizing.

TO DO LIST.

Jim Brown - will convene and chair an ad hoc task force on PLSS/Cadastral mapping as per the motion passed.

Larry Zink - will invite and, if possible, arrange for NRCS, NRC, and CSD to provide the Str. Cmte. with their agency's perspective and/or plans for how digital county soils data will be developed for Nebraska.

GIS Steering Committee
VOTING RECORD

Date __4/19/95__

	Attendance	Minutes #1	Cod. T.G. #2	Cll R. #3	Soils ld Adj. #4	Res Proc #5	Civil Def. #6	NRC #7				
DAS - Steve Henderson	A/P		NV	+	—	+	NV	NV				
DEQ - Dennis Burling Tom Lamberson	P	+	+	+	—	+	+	+				
CSD - Perry Wigley Les Howard, Jim Merchant	P	+	+	+	—	+	+	+				
NRC - Dayle Williamson Terry Kubicek	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				
PRO - Rod Armstrong	A/P					+	+	+				
DOR - Jon Ogden	P	+	+	+	—	+	+	+				
Surveyor - Jim Brown	A											
LRD - Laura Valenziano	A											
John Miyoshi	P	+	+	—	+	+	+	+				
Blaine Dinwiddie	P	+	+	+	—	+	+	+				
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	P	+	—	+	+	+	+	+				
Lash Chaffin	A											
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				
Dennis Wilson	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				
TOTALS	10-P / 12-P	10 (+)	9 (+) 1 (—) 1-NV	10 (+) 1 (—)	6 (+) 5 (—)	12 (+)	11 (+) 1-NV	11 (+) 1-NV				

P = present
A = absent

"+" = voting for
"—" = voting against
"NV" = not voting

\lzgen\votrecrd