

Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes -- April 22, 1999

Present were (authorized to vote +):

Mahendra Bansal		Natural Resources Commission
Jim Brown	+	State Surveyor's Office
Dennis Burling	+	Department of Environmental Quality
Lash Chaffin	+	League of Municipalities
Blaine Dinwiddie	+	Omaha Public Power District
John Erickson		Health and Human Services – Regulations and Licensure
Dick Genrich	+	Department of Roads
Val Goodman	+	Legislature
Mele Koneya	+	Nebraska Game and Parks
Nathan McCaleb	+	USDA-NRCS
John Miyoshi	+	Lower Platte Natural Resource District
Scott Richert		Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Duane Stott	+	Scottsbluff County Surveyor
Cliff Welsh	+	NACO - Keith County
Dayle Williamson	+	Natural Resources Commission
Paul Yamamoto		Department of Environmental Quality
Larry Zink		Coordinator, GIS Steering Committee

Complete Meeting Agenda

MAJOR MEETING TOPICS

<u>Multipurpose Land Information Systems</u>	<u>Governmental Units - Priority Databases</u>	<u>Transportation - Priority Database</u>
<u>Orthoimagery & Elevation - Priority Databases</u>	<u>Hydrography (Streams) - Priority Database</u>	<u>Hydrography (Reg. Wells) - Priority Database</u>
<u>Land Cover/Land Use - Priority Database</u>	<u>GIS/NITC Charter</u>	<u>Cooperative Funding for Geospatial Data</u>
<u>Long-range Goals and Objectives Review</u>	<u>Meeting Voting and Procedures Review</u>	<u>Education Subcommittee</u>
<u>GIS/LIS Association Planning Committee</u>	<u>Legislative Initiatives</u>	<u>Geospatial Data Sharing and Fees</u>
<u>1999/2000 Meeting Schedule</u>	<u>Height Modernization Effort</u>	<u>Next Meeting Date</u>
<u>Voting Record</u>		

NOTICE OF MEETING. A public notice of the meeting, pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R.S. 1943, was published in the Lincoln Journal-Star on Thursday, April 15, 1999.

ROLL CALL. Vice Chairperson Lash Chaffin called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. and requested a call of the roll. Eight duly authorized representatives were present. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES. Vice Chairperson Lash Chaffin asked for the approval of the January minutes. Dayle Williamson moved to approve the January minutes as distributed. Dick Genrich seconded the motion. Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed (see vote #1 on the attached Voting Record sheet).

Dayle asked what the status of the Nebraska Online contract was. Larry said that the State Records Board had accepted the changes the Steering Committee made and that the Interagency Agreement had been signed. Larry noted

that the separate addendum that was referred to in the agreement as setting forth the data recorded to be accessed has not yet been developed.

Dayle asked if there had been any further discussion regarding the Intergraph/ESRI local government grants. Duane Stott said that Tim Lowenstein (Buffalo County Commission and NACo contact for Intergraph arrangement) had been scheduled to speak at the Local Government Guidelines Advisory Committee meeting but could not attend. Larry said there have been a number of missed opportunities to get more information on this topic. First, Tim Lowenstein was unable to attend the Advisory Committee meeting where he had been scheduled to share more information. Then Larry had specifically requested this issue be put on the agenda at the FGDC partnership meeting in Washington DC, but then he was unable to attend due to his flight getting cancelled because of a snow storm. There had also been some discussion regarding a concurrent session at the GIS Symposium with Intergraph and ESRI but this didn't pan out either. Both vendors will be at the symposium but there will not be a specific session to address this topic.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR MULTI-PURPOSE LAND INFORMATION

SYSTEMS. Erik Hubl began by reviewing the original tasks assigned to the Advisory Committee and reporting the progress attained. The Advisory Committee was created for a one-year period that was extended in April of 1998. It is time for the Steering Committee to begin thinking about whether the Advisory Committee's term should be extended an additional year.

The Advisory Committee has been discussing a number of things with respect to the actual property parcel mapping project. Actual land ownership is considerably different from the legal lots. Parcels are made up of bits and pieces of legal lots. The Advisory Committee has determined that it was important to have both layers in a local government GIS, ownership parcels and legal lots. The Advisory Committee recognizes both layers as integral parts of the cadastral section they are working on. Aerial photography in the form of DOQQ's, makes it easier to see actual land use and to notice where the lots have been split and recombined. Erik noted that there is a uncompleted draft section of the cadastral standards available on the web. The Advisory Committee plans to release this for peer review at the GIS symposium and have a break out session to advise people of the standards to date and what is proposed for the future.

The Advisory Committee found out yesterday that they are going to have to rework somewhat the parcel ID structure section. They wanted to work with the Property Tax Division scheme and understood they had the opportunity to change the first portion of that numbering scheme. Currently, the Property Tax Division uses a four-digit number that starts with 0101 and goes to 4139. They started at one corner of the state and went through every township, assigning it a four-digit number. The Advisory Committee had understood that in the context, of a new PTD computer system and revised PTD regulations, that these initial four-digits could be changed to a five-digit number that would reflect the actual township range structure and would allow a person looking at that ID number to know what area of the state any piece of property is located. Therefore, the Advisory was recommending this change in the PTD's PIN and that it also be considered for adoption by counties statewide. However, yesterday they discovered that new regulations presented by the Property Tax Division did not include this change.

Dayle Williamson asked if creating a township range structure would increase the efficiency. Erik responded that it would provide a better intuitive understanding of location. Dayle asked if there was any way the property tax regulations could be amended as this is a long-term decision for the state. He suggested the CIO look into promoting this since it may not be in the best interest of the state for the regulations to go through without a township range structure.

Erik said that the new regulations intentionally omit identifying a parcel id structure like they used to have, allowing each county to develop/maintain their own parcel id structure. However, all records and sales information returned to the Property Tax Division needs to have the PTD identifying number listed there.

Larry commented that all counties already have their own parcel ID structure as well as the number they use when reporting to the Property Tax Division used for the state. The Advisory Committee had understood that there might be an opportunity to change that system as the Property Tax Division moves from the mainframe system to PCs. There must have been a communications glitch. They are talking with the Property Tax Division regarding this issue right

now, but ultimately, it is PTD's call. Dayle agreed, adding that the Steering Committee needs to make a recommendation about this.

Larry noted that Advisory Committee realized that it didn't have the authority to make counties change their PIN systems, but what the Advisory Committee had hoped was that we could propose a logical system that might be attractive for them to adopt, if and when they developed a GIS. Since the counties already have to report transactions to the PTD using the PTD's PIN system, the Committee felt that a slightly modified PTD PIN might have sufficient attraction to stimulate counties to adopt it as their county system. Duane Stott noted that there was a lot of confusion about the current PTD PIN system, because unless you use it all the time, you don't know which townships the PIN numbers refer to. Erik said that the Advisory Committee was hoping in their cadastral section to be able to point to the Property Tax Division's modified PIN as the example for counties acquiring a GIS system.

Dayle urged that the Committee follow through in making a recommendation on the PIN and recommended that an agenda item be added for the next meeting to address the need to re-authorize the Advisory Committee.

Follow-up on Database Advisory Committees.

Governmental Units. Larry said that this committee is likely to be dormant until after the Legislative session as Val Goodman, Chair, is very busy with legislative IT support activities.

Transportation. Dick Genrich said this Advisory Committee would be dormant until after the GIS Symposium and they get Ed Kelley back and recovered from his heart problems.

DOQ/DEM. Dayle said that the first round of DOQ's and DEM's are complete. The NRC is looking at doing a pilot project with Lancaster County for revised DOQs. They have good cooperation with the County Assessor and the NRD to begin seeing how to update the DOQ's for Lancaster County after the 1999 NAP flights are complete.

John commented that there had been discussion about a having an open house once that project was complete. Dayle said that had not been totally forgotten yet. They will still probably host that in their office.

Streams. Mike Thompson, DWR, reported that the Advisory Committee has spent a lot of time researching the available water resources databases. One project that is going to be completed within the year is a National Hydrographic Database, which is being done jointly by the EPA and the USGS. The scale on that is 1:100,000. Mike reported that a number of agencies felt that the database and attribute model (i.e., stream banks, stream centerline network, EPA river reach codes, etc.) that has been developed for this national dataset would be very useful. However several of these agencies have found in the past that the many stream segments were not very well represented at a 1:100,000 scale and felt that 1:24,000 scale stream vectors were needed for state and local work.

Mike noted that several of these agencies have been using a 1:24,000-scale stream vector coverage developed by the NRC. This coverage was developed several years ago from paper maps and at the time it was developed the objective was to capture at least the major stream segment in each watershed area. Since then, agencies have pursued other projects that have required additional stream segment vectors that were not originally digitized in this NRC streams database. From time to time, some of these additional stream segments have been added, but there was a clear feeling in the Advisory Committee that a more complete 1:24,000 scale stream vector coverage was needed. In addition, the NRC coverage does not include the attributes, such as the EPA reach codes, that are included in the national hydrographic framework dataset model. Mike noted that for some agencies, vectors are more important, for others, accurate attribute coding is more important, but all felt that a 1:24,000 NHD, based on the 1:100,000 model would meet most of their stream/surface water database needs.

Staff from DEQ and NRC worked together and came up with a couple of approaches that could be used to generate this kind of product. The committee has also had a meeting with the US Geological Survey to discuss possible cooperative efforts and what their roles could be.

The Streams Working Group of the Water Resources Advisory Committee has drafted a rough work plan outlining two different approaches for developing the 1:24,000 stream vector coverage. The Working Group determined that a

pilot project, for a small area, was needed to further research these different stream vector methodologies and to determine which is the best. The National Hydrographic Dataset is segmented into hydrologic catalog units, or watersheds. The Working Group proposed to select one cataloging unit for a pilot project and run through each methodology to generate the final product to determine which method is the best. Such a pilot project effort would also provide the background experience and information to allow an estimate to be made for what it might cost to develop the database for the entire state.

Mike noted that the Working Group has not selected a catalog unit for a pilot project effort yet, although they have two units in mind, both on the Platte River. One is from the confluence of the Loup River down to the confluence of Shell Creek. The other is from the confluence of Shell Creek down to the confluence of the Platte with the Missouri.

Mike indicated that a resolution has been drafted for the Steering Committee's consideration to determine if the Advisory Committee is on track and if it is a reasonable course of action to pursue.

Larry said that because of the consensus that developed around the 1:24,000 scale stream network coverage, the Water Resources Advisory Committee did pass a resolution. This resolution endorses a pilot project to explore the methodology in developing this and urges the Steering Committee to encourage agencies, state, local and federal to look for opportunities to pursue such a pilot project. Larry said he had drafted a similar resolution for the consideration of the Steering Committee. The resolution recognizes the importance of this effort and urges state, federal and local agencies to look for avenues to explore a pilot project in the development of a 1:24,000 NHD.

Larry noted that the first of the two methodologies the Committee is proposing to explore is fairly close to a standard method the USGS has used. The 1:24,000 stream separates would be scanned in from the USGS quad maps and then the attributes conflated from the 1:100,000 NHD. The other methodology is looking at enhancing the current 1:24,000 coverage the NRC has to include the streams segments that are missing and possibly to add more current data based on the DOQs.

Larry reported that NRC has indicated that they currently do not have the resources to pursue this pilot project effort, but maybe they will next year. Dayle confirmed that NRC supports the project but does not currently have the resources.

Lash asked what the additional workload would be to develop the coverages at a 1:24,000 scale versus a 1:100,000 scale. Dayle indicated that would be a question answered by the pilot project but he estimated it would take approximately two people three months to complete the pilot project.

Larry said that the options available now are for the interested agencies to contribute some money to complete the pilot project to determine the scale of the resources needed to complete the whole state and/or to request money from the collaborative funds developed by the state for IT projects. Lash asked if there are irrigation districts out there doing this type of work so that a collaboration could develop. Larry said that they spoke with several different groups who indicated they would like to have a database of this type and that they would use if it were available. However, none them so far have indicated that it is a top priority for them and therefore that they are willing to develop it.

Nathan McCaleb said that the Corps of Engineers in Omaha has come up with a database for streams in Nebraska with 5 CFS. Larry indicated that the Working Group needed to find out more about this database.

Larry said that reference attributes are important missing pieces in the databases the Working Group is aware of. The NHD is designed to be a reference database and it therefore incorporates stream segment attribute coding. If the database is set up with these attributes, then as agencies begin doing different projects related to surface water, they will be able to tie them to these attribute reference codes. If those attributes are not included in other databases, as they are developed, then it will be much more difficult to interrelate and cross reference this surface water data down the road. The longer it takes for the reference database to be developed, the more data will be collected that does not incorporate those common identifiers.

Cliff said that if the Steering Committee is going to recommend these projects be done a time limit for completion might need to be added. Data can become irrelevant or inaccurate. Larry said that he has drafted another resolution

dealing with creating a funding source for collaborative database development. This database is a perfect example to use to show lawmakers why a fund of this sort should be developed; a number of agencies need this information but none has the resources to develop it. The USGS has agreed to cost share 50/50 if someone else will cover half the cost.

Dayle moved to accept the resolution from the Advisory Committee and recommended approval for the resolution dated 4/22/99 on the pilot project efforts to develop the 1:24,000 national hydrographic data set. John Miyoshi seconded. The motion passed (see vote #2).

Registered Wells. Paul said that this group was created by the Water Resources Advisory Committee to look at groundwater issues. They decided to concentrate on trying to improve the location data of the Department of Water Resources registered wells database. Currently, the information contained in the registered wells database was generated by converting legal descriptions to latitude/longitude coordinates. The Committee looked to see where agencies were collecting better locational information. They discovered that there is a significant amount of work going on by several agencies to improve locational information, but none of that information is getting back to the Department of Water Resources' registered wells database. Through the NRDs, 15,000 have already been GPSed and that information is distributed to the NRDs. This highlights the need to get that information to the Department of Water Resources and update their records. *See draft report.*

In order to accomplish that goal and to ensure some quality in the data, they have come up with some basic fields or metadata that would have to accompany any information submitted to the Department of Water Resources. They are still working on simplifying these fields.

The committee has also worked on taking those fields and generating a guidance document for the Department of Water Resources to distribute to any agency that could collect and provide coordinates back to them that would let them know exactly what needed to be included.

Larry noted that at the last meeting it was decided that it would be helpful to have some sort of endorsement from the Steering Committee. He has not had time to draft a resolution yet but will have one for the next meeting.

Dayle asked what sort of timeline they were looking at. Paul said that the basics were already in place but there were some design changes in the registered wells database that the Department of Water Resources will have to have to look into. The committee was not able to make a time commitment for completion. Some of these issues include assigning clear identifying numbers to the agencies contributing coordinates and determining generalized ranges of accuracy.

Jim Brown asked if all the readings would be kept in the registered wells database since there may be several different types of readings for a given well. Paul said that was another issue that needed to be addressed. It is why they want to develop a generalized set of standards and try to order them in terms of degree of accuracy. Currently, the database consists of converted legal descriptions. If a new reading came in, it would supercede the old reading. The old readings would be archived.

John commented that the next logical step is to get the well drillers to use GPS units. Paul said that was addressed in the committee too, requiring registration of wells to be accompanied by a GPSed coordinate. John said that their board has agreed if that happens they will cost share with the well drillers. Larry said that DWR is trying to get the well drillers to take on the responsibility of registering the wells, currently the responsibility rests with the property owner.

One of the biggest challenges is ensuring the GPS coordinates match the well registration. If the GPS coordinates come in with the registration, then it will be possible to accurately pinpoint the well location. Paul said that will be a long-term goal. Anyone providing information to the DWR database would be required to have the well registration number. That would make the data collected at the well more usable to other people because it would be tied back to the Department of Water Resources database.

Larry said that there is no action required by the Steering Committee now but there will likely be a resolution at the next meeting. Dayle commended the Advisory Committee for their efforts.

Land Cover/Land Use. Larry said that Jim Merchant will begin working on this effort after the symposium.

EXECUTIVE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.

DRAFT GIS/NITC CHARTER. Jim Brown said the first item is a draft GIS/NITC charter developed by the the Executive Subcommittee and Larry, with the assistance of Steve Schafer, the new Chief Information Officer..

Larry said that the intent of this document is to establish a clearer understanding and working relationship between the Steering Committee and the NITC. Dayle said that LB924 was not very clear and many Advisory Committees are creating charters. Lash said that the Executive Committee went over this document line by line last week and the main point for the Steering Committee is in Section 8 of the draft charter.

Dennis Burling asked why Section 7 (*defines of the Meeting Procedures of the Steering Committee*) had been included. Jim Brown said that there were a number of committees creating charters and they wanted the language to be parallel in all of them. Dennis asked why the meeting procedures, mission statements and membership for the Commission and the Steering Committee were included.

Larry noted that for some of these groups (Government, Education, Community Councils), their entire existence/authorization is based on the NITC and these sections define how they will operate. Larry indicated that Steve Schafer, the new Chief Information Officer, wanted to make the language and structure parallel to the others. Dennis said that if this is submitted this way, then the Steering Committee will have to readdress this resolution every time a change is made in the meeting procedures. Dennis suggested incorporating meeting procedures by reference instead of verbatim. Lash said that the purpose of putting the meeting procedures in this document is to demonstrate that the Steering Committee is a genuine entity with real meetings. Accuracy is not the issue. Jim Brown said that they discussed this with Steve Schafer and asked if minor changes needed to be addressed in subsequent meetings and he said they did not.

Erik asked if section 8.2.4 means that when the Advisory Committee comes up with draft standards those standards have to be approved by both the Steering Committee as well as the NITC. Jim Brown said that the way the statutes have changed, that may be the case. Jim suggested that might be a benefit however, because it allows the Steering Committee to present this information to a higher level.

Dennis asked about section 5, the draft version of a Steering Committee mission statement. Larry said that the Steering Committee does not currently have a mission statement. Larry indicated that to be parallel in form, for this draft charter, he developed a draft mission statement for the Steering Committee's consideration. Dennis suggested dropping the mission statement altogether. It was reported that the Executive Subcommittee had discussed this issue and decided to ask the Steering Committee to consider the draft mission statement for adoption. Dennis said that his objection was not to the statement but to the tense. His understanding was that a mission statement was designed to speak to the future.

Lash Chaffin moved the draft mission statement be approved as the Steering Committee's mission statement. Dayle Williamson seconded. The motion passed (see vote #3).

Dick Genrich moved to approve the draft Resolution of Cooperation between the NITC and the NGISSC. Val Goodman seconded. The motion passed (see vote #4).

DRAFT CALL FOR COOPERATIVE GEOSPATIAL DATA FUNDING SOURCE. Jim Brown asked for discussion about the background paper Larry drafted regarding a cooperative or collaborative funding mechanism. Dayle said that the paper does a good job of addressing the issues. If Nebraska is going to stay on the leading edge, policymakers need to start looking at database development.

Lash asked if using the documenting stamp tax was still a possibility. Larry said it has been suggested a few times but has not been approved. The last time it was changed, a small fee was added and dedicated to the homeless. Thus far its distribution has not been changed. The Steering Committee has not had a policy maker champion the idea of using

part of the documenting stamp tax for the Steering Committee. Cathy Lang from the Property Tax Division was thought to be ideal for the task but she has not express any interest in moving with it.

Lash said that the a potential problem with changing the title tax is that the Nebraska Realtors Association might block any such efforts. Larry said if the Steering Committee were to seriously consider this avenue, they would have to deal with this reality and would have to convince the realtors that they would benefit from the creation of geospatial databases and improvement in Nebraska's GIS position. Dayle pointed out that the big issue is a lack of understanding of the importance and use of GIS databases.

Larry agreed that the conceptual hurdle that needs to be overcome is communicating to policy makers that these databases are infrastructure. A lot of funding is allocated to information technology such as hardware and software with a little for training but the value of databases has not been recognized. Duane commented that he has seen another partnership effort ESRI is making in the GIS arena to help build databases. The private sector may start to see that it is to their benefit to help develop these.

Larry said that this paper and resolution will be going to the Government Council, who has been charged with developing an information technology plan, to let them know that this is a need that should be factored into their planning. It will also be going to the NITC, the Governor, and the DAS Director. Val said this will be a hard sell to most policy makers. There are several senators who do understand GIS, but it is likely to get bogged down in committee.

Jim Brown said that this document basically states that developing adequate data sets will require collaborative efforts.

Dennis suggested defining framework geospatial databases in the resolution. There are many types of geospatial databases and the Steering Committee is really only interested in specific subset for this funding.

Larry asked if Dennis meant specifically listing all of the framework databases the Steering Committee is working on, Geodetic Control, Hydrographic, PLS, Transportation, DEMs, Aerial Photography, Soils, etc. Dennis said those are the databases the Steering Committee is most interested in.

Jim Brown noted that he wants this document to be a single page in length, easily digestible by the senators. If changes are made, they cannot be of a nature as to extend the length of this document beyond one page.

Dennis expressed concern that the senators would not know what a geospatial database is. Jim Brown pointed out that they probably will not understand what a Hydrographic or Geodetic Control is either. Lash agreed that a clarifying definition is unlikely to significantly enhance a senator's knowledge or understanding. Dennis agreed that was a distinct possibility but if they read the document and think Health and Human Services, then the resolution has not filled its purpose.

However, there was general agreement that the document needed to remain one page in length. Larry suggested adding 'streams, roads, property parcels, etc.' in parentheses after the first reference to framework databases. This suggestion seemed to be workable for everyone.

Dennis moved to accept the draft resolution as amended. Dayle seconded. The motion passed (see vote #5).

At this point in the meeting, the Steering Committee took a break. Unfortunately, when the Committee resumed its meeting, no one remembered right away to turn the tape recorder back on. Consequently, the meeting notes for the remainder of the Executive Committee agenda items, until the beginning of the Education Subcommittee report, are from Larry Zink's memory. However, no official action was taken during these discussions.

REVIEW OF LONG-RANGE GOALS AND CURRENT PROGRESS. Larry noted that when the Steering Committee re-organized itself about a year ago, it charged the Executive Committee with the task of periodically stimulating and leading a review of Goals and Objectives and an assessment of how well the Steering Committee is doing in pursuing and achieving those goals. Since it had been about a year since these goals and objectives had been

adopted, it was probably time for such a review. Jim Brown led the Steering Committee through a short process of review.

DATABASE GOAL. Actively coordinate the development, maintenance, and distribution of priority statewide digital geospatial databases. It was noted that the priority databases had been identified and that Initial Assessment Reports had been prepared on most of these priority databases. The Steering Committee had also authorized advisory committees and designated lead agencies for the advisory committees on several of the priority databases. It was also noted that significant work and proposals had been forthcoming from the Water Resources Advisory Committee, and to a lesser extent from the Advisory Committee on Orthoimagery and Elevation Databases. It was however, noted that the other database advisory committees had either not gotten started or had seriously slowed their efforts after an initial spurt following the advisory committees' creation last fall. While it was noted that both the legislative session and the GIS Symposium had diverted a fair amount of energy, it was suggested that it was important to get all of these database advisory committee reinvigorated and that they review the objectives identified in the authorizing resolutions passed by the Steering Committee.

LAND RECORDS GOAL. The promotion and facilitation of local government land record modernization and GIS development. It was noted that the PLSS Pilot Project was nearly completed in three of the four counties. It had been decided to not pursue the project to completion in Hall County. While an interim report had been included in the Steering Committee's Annual Report, (focusing on Adams County), a final report still needed to be written. It was also noted that the project is now being expanded into counties that have turned their assessment responsibilities over to the PTD. It was noted that the Advisory Committee on Standards for Local Government Multipurpose Land Information Systems continues its work, and is slowly producing guidelines for these local government systems. It was also noted that the Nebraska Plane Coordinate System Act was enacted by the Legislature as was called for in the long-range goal's objectives. It was noted that additional work is needed on goal's objectives: a) to build private and public organizational support for funding of local government land record modernization initiatives; and b) to encourage and support the Property Tax Division to take a leadership role in assisting the local governments with their land record modernization efforts.

EDUCATION GOAL. Strengthen the GIS Education Subcommittee and its overall educational program activities. The tremendous amount of work related to the organization and hosting of the 1999 Nebraska GIS Symposium was noted. Also noted was the related effort to develop a Nebraska GIS/LIS Association to help with GIS education efforts. Both of these related efforts have substantially increased the number of people involved with GIS education efforts. The GIS Update newsletter has been continued thanks to the support of both CSD-UNL and NDOR. The objective of developing a multi-year education plan has not been achieved. It was noted that one of the major stumbling blocks was the lack of financial resources to address the needs for GIS education and outreach. The Education Subcommittee had developed a budget proposal and the Steering Committee had requested a budget to support this education and outreach work, but the budget proposal was not supported by the new administration.

FINANCIAL GOAL. Increase financial support for the GIS Steering Committee goals and programs. It was noted that the Steering Committee had requested a budget increase to more accurately reflect what it is doing and needs to do relative to its statutory responsibilities. The budget requested asked for an increase from \$3,000 in operating costs to \$10,000, and a program budget increase from the current \$0 to \$40,000 for education, outreach and coordination. The Steering Committee had also requested staff resources for one additional person to work with the current Steering Committee Coordinator to address unmet education and outreach needs. It was noted that while the out-going administration had not included the additional staff resources, they had included the increased operating and program resources in their budget proposal. Unfortunately, none of these proposals for additional resources were included in the new administration's budget proposal. The Committee discussed the difficulty of finding a way to make the case for the need for these new resources to a new administration, with a very short timeline for drawing up a budget proposal. The Committee expressed its commitment to do a better job of making the case for these needs in the next budget cycle.

STRUCTURE AND PROCESS GOAL. Evaluate the GIS Steering Committee's operational process and structure. It was noted that consistent with this goal's objective, a subcommittee was formed and proposed some structural and process changes, which were adopted by the Steering Committee. One of those changes, was the current review process, which was assigned to the Executive Committee. Others include the database advisory committees, which have been discussed in relation to the database goal.

REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING AND VOTING PROCEDURES. Larry noted that the Steering Committee is scheduled to have an election for its Chair and Vice Chair at its next meeting. Larry reported that in the process of developing the draft GIS/NITC charter, it became clear that the Steering Committee needs to revise its adopted voting policies and procedures. The current policies and procedures were adopted by the Steering Committee in 1993 and since then three additional members have been added to the Committee and a fourth member is likely to be added this legislative session. Larry noted that the current policies still refer to a quorum as eight members (Str. Cmte. formerly had 15 members, but now 18) and as requiring eight votes to take a formal action by the Steering Committee.

Jim Brown reported that the Executive Committee had discussed the need to revise these policies and procedures and had decided to just call it to the Steering Committee's attention at this meeting. The Executive Committee felt this would give members the opportunity to think about the procedures and then amend them at the next meeting prior to an election of officers. There followed a general discussion about the nature of the policy changes that might need to be made. From the discussion, two proposed changes were put forward for consideration at the next meeting.

1. **Quorum.** A quorum of the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee shall consist of ~~eight~~ duly at least fifty (50%) percent of the duly authorized members. Duly authorized members shall include all representatives appointed by the Governor and the ex-officio state officers identified by law or their designees.
4. **Vote Required.** The affirmative vote of at least ~~eight~~ duly authorized a majority of the committee members present shall be required to take action and make determinations.

It was also noted that in procedure #6 on Subcommittees, there was an editorial revised needed to make "Subcommittee(s)" plural at the beginning of the second sentence. There was also discussion about the need or desirability of modifying #2 on "Designees of Ex-officio Members" in that it does not allow non-state agency directors to designate an alternate. Questions were raised related to the legality of any change to this section, and in the end, there did not appear to be support for making a change to this particular section. It was decided that an early agenda item on the next meeting should be the possible revision of the Steering Committee's Voting Policies and Procedures.

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE. Larry noted that Jim Merchant was not at this meeting because he was working on final arrangements for the Symposium. Larry also noted that the GIS Symposium will be held on May 11 & 12. There are approximately 275 people pre-registered. There are 21 benefactor/co-sponsor organizations, groups who have donated money to cosponsor the symposium. There are 4 advocates, organizations who just lent their organizational names. There will be 19 three-hour short courses and 14 one and a half-hour concurrent sessions. Larry said one of the concurrent sessions will be about the GIS Steering Committee. Larry, Jim, Lash and Anne Peyton, GIS Coordinator from Iowa will be on the panel.

As part of this symposium, there will be a breakfast meeting on the second day, which will serve as the official first meeting of the Nebraska GIS/LIS Association. Scott Richert was elected president and they have a volunteer interim board.

GIS/LIS ASSOCIATION PLANNING COMMITTEE. Scott said that John Berans, State Surveyors Office, was elected secretary and Jim Lacy, CSD-UNL, was elected as treasurer. John Erickson from Health and Human Services, Ed Kelley from the Department of Roads, Kelly Klenke from the NRCS, Scott McIntyre from Omaha Public Works Department, Jeff Peaks from the University of Nebraska Omaha, and Marcia Roberts from the Windstone, Inc. are also on the board.

LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES. Jim Brown said that the only initiative on the board for the Steering Committee

was to allow for the compensation of subcommittee members. Larry reported that initiative passed.

Larry said that another initiative of interest is the HHS general clean up bill. In that legislation is a provision for HHS to acquire a seat on the Steering Committee. It is out of committee and into the legislature and expected to pass.

GEOSPATIAL DATA SHARING AND FEES. Larry noted that he had put this issue on the agenda because the Appropriations Committee had raised the issue of cost recover with NRC during a recent hearing. Dayle reported that he spent the afternoon with the Appropriations Committee and told them about their DOQ project. He said the big issue with the Committee was cost recovery. The NRC promised to have something back to the Committee on cost recovery next year.

Part of the Appropriations Committee was quiet on the issue and part was very vehement. Dayle said that he reminded them of the problems encountered by the DMV and Nebraska Online when they attempted to charge additional funds. The Appropriations Committee did not feel that was an issue.

Dayle said that they would not go forward with anything like that without express instructions from the Legislature. He opposes any cost recovery efforts, partly because the taxpayers have already paid for the development of this resource. In addition, the NRC is heavily involved in cost share projects with federal agencies that would mostly likely object if the NRC began charging for the final product.

Larry noted that about a year and a half ago, he had brought to the Steering Committee the idea of a data sharing cooperative. Larry noted at the time, the Steering Committee had expressed interest in the model, but it didn't go much further. A model had been developed in the State of New York. The concept is based a framework where the agencies sign a cooperative agreement to share geospatial data. All the agencies are public agencies. As part of the cooperative agreement, agencies further agree that they will not pass on the data originating from one agency to another agency. If someone wants the data, they have to go back to the original source agency. Further, if errors are discovered, cooperative agreement participants agree to notify the original source agency. While the cooperative agency facilitates data sharing among the public agencies that are participants, it also allows them to sell their data to those outside the cooperative.

Lash asked if the question is whether it is appropriate for the Steering Committee to have a position on fees. Larry indicated that he thought that Dayle could return to the Legislature with the Steering Committee's specific support for non-fee access to the DEM/DOQs, or the Steering Committee could develop a more proactive data sharing framework that might also incorporate state, local and federal agencies and share that with the Legislature.

John said that if it is infrastructure, then it is something that government should be providing. Lash pointed out that cities have a lot of infrastructure that they charge for like pools and golf courses.

Larry clarified that the coop model permits charging for data but does not require it.

Dayle said that the issue he was attempting to address with the Legislature was that running the Databank is considerably easier now than it was fifteen years ago. There were so many requests that used to come in that a lot of resources had to be devoted to locating and filling data requests. It has become considerably more cost effective because people can fill their own requests.

Larry asked Erik what the official policy was if a state agency was to ask for data. Erik said that his agency officially cooperates with State agencies. They have a pricing structure in place for every data set they have. If they have to repackage and sell the information, the price doubles.

Larry asked if this was an issue that the Steering Committee wanted him to continue to pursue this topic.

Jim Brown said that whenever they go before the Legislature to discuss a new product that they plan to make available to the public, they are asked about charging for it. So far, explaining that it costs more to charge for it than to give it away has been acceptable. Eventually that will not be acceptable. Eventually, the Steering Committee will have to address this issue. His personal belief is that information should be available to the public without cost. However, a

system needs to be put in place to allow state, local and federal agencies to freely share information. There was general support express for Larry to continue to explore the cooperative data-sharing model and to bring that information to the Steering Committee.

MEETING TIMES FOR 1999/2000. Larry noted that the Steering Committee's agreed upon meeting schedule runs out in July. He also noted that he had posted a proposed meeting schedule a couple weeks ago. He said that he has space reserved on the East Campus for these times and dates. Roads also has space available as well or other areas can be explored. In the discussion that followed, some members expressed a preference for East Campus and some for Roads. The decision on meeting schedule and location was finally left to Larry. Revised 1999-2000 meeting schedule.

THE NEED FOR HEIGHT MODERNIZATION EFFORT. Jim Brown reported that Erik Hubl and Brian Dunnigan had drafted a document addressing the need for height modernization. Jim Brown noted he has been talking to National Geodetic Survey (NGS) about this and the real problem is the NGS does not know where they are headed with height modernization.

Brown reported that previously, they had worked out a pilot project for Lancaster County on height modernization through Larry Worrell. They are going to try to get NGS to work on the Lancaster project with them. Brown noted that height modernization is an expensive proposition, but it something that must be done if the vertical plane is to be utilized.

Erik commented that they developed this document in the format it is in to allow Nebraska to submit a request to the federal government to be included in the pilot project they are currently working on creating. The Steering Committee needs to get the attention of representatives in the house to make the case for Nebraska.

Larry asked if there needed to be a motion to act on this.

John asked who was heading up this effort in Washington. Erik said that this is being spearheaded by the National Geodetic Survey, under the Department of Commerce.

Jim Brown said that his understanding of the problem is getting it through NOAA. NOAA is into different things from the NGS and their requests get dropped out of the budget.

Dennis pointed out that Senator Kerrey is a member of the Technology Commission and suggested this issue be passed to him as a part of the technological advancement of the state. Larry said that legislators are not probably aware of this issue but sending this paper along with the endorsement of the Steering Committee will bring it to their attention. Dennis suggested speaking with Steve Schafer. Larry agreed but added that any correspondence with legislators will carry more weight if accompanied by the Steering Committee's endorsement.

Jim Brown said that this problem is part of a deeper issue relating to NGS's mission and how it has changed. The Steering Committee can bring this issue to the attention of Congressman Bereuter but it will likely be ineffective until NGS determines that their mission is to support people in Nebraska.

Dayle said that people in the agency are enthused and feel this needs to be done but that enthusiasm does not carry up to the people who control the resources. As with many other tasks, this task is being shifted to the states. States that will provide cooperation and cost sharing programs will begin to get this done.

Larry asked if the Steering Committee was comfortable with giving their support to this document before it is given to Steve Schafer or Lieutenant Governor Maurstad. There was general acceptance.

Dennis Burling moved to give GIS Steering Committee endorsement of concepts outlined in the White Paper on the Need for a Height Modernization Effort in Nebraska. Cliff Welsh seconded. The motion passed (see vote #6).

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS UPDATES ON THEIR AGENCY GIS ACTIVITIES. John Miyoshi said that UNO is looking into establishing a GIS masters degree program. There will be an internship as a part of this program and they will likely be looking for places to put these students to perform real world tasks.

Jim Brown said that the US Forest Service and the BLM have contacted the State Surveyors Office to do the public land survey system in 51 townships that comprise the US forest service areas. They are going to contract out to do that.

The State Surveyors Office has been working in Dodge County. They have scanned all of Dodge County's records. An optical disk is now available of the original survey maps.

Larry said there is a Federal Agencies meeting on the day before the Symposium. Larry also noted that the Western Governor's Association is planning to set up a GIS policy group. Larry reported that Josh Lear, NRC, has been appointed by the Governor to serve in that group. Dayle indicated that Josh will work with and report back to GIS Steering Committee in this role.

OTHER BUSINESS. There was no other business. The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be **Thursday, May 20, 1999 at 1:00 PM** at the Department of Roads auditorium.

Vote Tallies for 4-22-99 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting										
	Roll call	Min. #1	1:24K NHD #2	Mission Statement #3	NITC-GIS Resol. #4	Coop. Funding Res. #5	Height Modern. #6	#7	#8	#9
DAS - Rick Becker (Lori McClurg)	A
DEQ - Tom Lamberson (Mike Linder) Dennis Burling	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
CSD - Mark Kuzila, Jim Merchant, Les Howard	A
NGPC - <u>Mele Koneya</u> Bruce Sackett	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
NRC - <u>Dayle Williamson</u> Mahendra Bansal	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
PRO - Lauren Hill	A
PTD - Cathy Lang Bob Martin, Scott Gaines	A
DOR - <u>Dick Genrich</u> (John Craig) Jon Ogden	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
St. Surv - Jim Brown	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
LRD - Val Goodman	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
Nathan McCaleb	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
John Miyoshi	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
<u>Blaine Dinwiddie</u> Steve Larson	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	A
Lash Chaffin	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.

Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	.	.	.
Dennis Wilson	A
TOTALS	8 - P / 12 - P	8 - +	12 - +	12 - +	12 - +	12 - +	12 - +

"P"=present, "A"=absent, "+"=voting for, "-"=voting against, "NV"=not voting

Return to GIS Steering Committee Home Page