

GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes - 11/15/95

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
* Blaine Dinwiddie	Omaha Public Power District
* Val Goodman	Legislative Computer Services
Erik Hubl	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Mele Koneya	Game and Parks Commission
* Terry Kubicek	Natural Resources Commission
* Jimi Merchant	Conservation and Survey Division
* John Miyoshi	Lower Platte NRD
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
* Tom Ryan	Governor's Policy Research Office
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
* Cliff Welsh	Keith County Commissioner
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 November 8, 1995.

ROLL CALL. Chair Rod Armstrong called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 pm and requested a call of the roll. Ten duly authorized representatives were present and therefore a quorum was present to conduct business. John Miyoshi and Val Goodman arrived later during the meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS. Rod A. introduced Tom Ryan as a new member of the GIS Str. Cmte. representing the Governor's Policy Research Office. Rod A. informed the Str. Cmte. that he had been named as the Dept. of Administrative Services representative, replacing Steve Henderson, on the Str. Cmte. and Tom Ryan and been named to replace Rod as PRO's representative.

MINUTES. Rod A. invited a motion to approve the minutes of the Sept. 27, 1995 meet. Terry K. expressed a concern about what he felt were the editorial comments inserted in the circulated draft minutes of that meeting. Terry K. indicated that he was referring to the italicized sections on page 3 of the draft minutes which referred to previous actions of the Str. Cmte. Terry K. indicated that since minutes were to be a record of what was said in the meeting, that these inserts should not be part of the minutes. Terry K. moved, Cliff W. seconded, that these inserts (italics on page 3) be stricken from the draft minutes. The discussion that followed the motion noted that the inserts in questions were quotes from previous Str. Cmte. minutes and that they were clearly marked as such within the draft minutes. It was also noted that these quoted sections were referred to in the course of the previous meeting's discussion. It was also clarified that there was no question as to the accuracy of the quoted inserts. Jim B. moved to amend Terry K.'s motion to retain the italicized sections, but to move them to an addendum section with a reference in the body of the minutes. Jim B.'s proposed amendment was accepted as a friendly amendment by Terry K. and Cliff W. The amended motion failed to pass with six "for", two "against", and two "not voting" (*Str. Cmte. policy requires a vote of at least eight "for" to pass a motion*)(see vote #1 on the attached Voting Record sheet).

Jim B. moved, Jon O. seconded, that the minutes of the Sept. 27, 1996 meeting be approved as distributed. The motion to approve, as distributed, failed to pass on a vote of seven "for", one "against", and two "not voting" (*Str. Cmte. policy requires a vote of at least eight "for" to pass a motion*)(see vote #2 on the attached Voting Record sheet).

UPDATE ON CADASTRE / PLSS TASK FORCE. Jim B. and Larry Z. gave the Str. Cmte. an update on the efforts by the Task Force. It was noted that at the last Str. Cmte. meeting the Task Force had reported that the State Surveyor was offering to develop and maintain a database of identification numbers and approximate coordinates for all the original government corners. The hope was that this would encourage and facilitate most GIS users to use these common identifiers for original government corners and thereby facilitate data sharing.

Terry K. raised a question about how comprehensive this original government corner Id database would be. Terry K. noted that the draft definition of a Public Lands Survey System Digital Base Map included a reference to "all the monumented survey marks". Terry K. noted that when NRC does some of its GPS work, it monuments those points with a steel rods embedded in the ground. Terry wondered whether all of these would be included in the PLSS Base Map. Jim B. indicated that was not the intent of the Task Force and consequently the choice of wording probably needs to be reconsidered.

Suggested Minimum Standard Subset of Property Parcel Attributes to Facilitate Data Sharing.

Jim B. and Larry Z. reported that the Task Force had focused a considerable amount of time in their recent meetings on how to facilitate sharing land record information. It was determined, based on the level of anticipated need, that facilitating regional data sharing was probably the highest priority. This would include information sharing for such entities as school districts, natural resources districts, fire districts, etc. To facilitate this regional data sharing, the Task Force identified a number of associated attributes that a local governments should be able to provide, in a standardized format, along with the property parcel boundary coordinates. This draft minimum subset of attributes to facilitate data sharing includes the following:

- Assessor's Parcel ID #
- County ID #
- Parcel Address (including City, State, Zip)
- Tax District ID #
- An Indicator of whether the Parcel Description is based on Urban or Rural Legal Description (U/R)
- PLSS Section/Township/Range/E-W Range
- or -
- City/Subdivision/Block/Lot

Blaine D. expressed a concern about the apparent absence of the graphical component of the land records in this list of attributes. Blaine D. noted that it is this graphical component which is the key to GIS. Jim B. noted that, at least for the interim period, some counties will not have this graphic capability and this subset of attributes needed to be constructed to also facilitate data sharing with those counties. Larry Z. noted that this list of attributes was intended to be standardized attribute data that would be shared along with the property parcel coordinates which define the boundaries of the parcel. He noted that the property parcel coordinates are included in the draft definition of a property parcel base map, but that it might be clearer to include the coordinates in this list, along with the attributes.

Jim B. and Larry Z. also reported that a current focus of the Task Force is to explore the feasibility of developing a GIS database model for a local government's land record information. Such a model would then be available as a resource for local governments to draw from as they move into this area. It was noted that one of the areas of concern is how to best integrate the property parcel information as developed and used by the County Assessors, with that developed and used by the County Register of Deeds. There are several instances in which property parcels are defined differently by these two key offices, and yet for a county-wide GIS information must flow between the two systems. The Task Force has decided that one practical step in this area would be to learn more about the specific functioning of these local government offices. In this regard, the Task Force is attempting to schedule a meeting with, and a presentation by, Saunders County officials on their land record management procedures. Depending on the results of this meeting, meetings with other counties may also be scheduled. Terry K. suggested that the Task Force request executive summaries of this type of land record management schemes for groups like Wyandotte and Osage Counties in Kansas. Larry Z. indicated that he would do that and also states like Wisconsin.

MINUTES II. Rod A. asked the Str. Cmte. to return to the issue of the minutes and he invited a motion to reconsider the motion to approve the minutes, based on the concept of moving the sections in question to an addendum section. Terry K. moved to reconsider the motion to approve the minutes, Tom Ryan seconded. The motion to reconsider passed on a vote of 10 "for" and two "not voting" (*see vote #2 on the attached Voting Record sheet*). Terry K. then moved, Jim B. seconded, to amend the draft minutes to move the italicized sections to an addendum section, with a reference in the body of the minutes. The motion to amend the minutes passed with a vote of ten "for" and two "not voting" (*see vote #3 on the attached Voting Record sheet*). It was then moved and seconded (*recorder missed who moved and seconded the motion*) to approve the minutes of the Sept. 27, 1996 minutes, as amended. The motion passed with ten voting "for" and two "not voting" (*see the vote #4 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

NACO CONVENTION. Larry Z. reported that Duane S. and Erik H. had gone to a considerable effort to tear down, transport, and assemble components of their GIS to have them available for "show and tell" in the GIS Str. Cmte. booth at the NACO Convention in Omaha. Larry also noted that Duane S. and Les Duggart, Scottsbluff County Assessor, conducted a breakout session at the Convention on GIS implementation. Duane S. reported that he felt that there was a lot of interest among convention participants. Duane also noted that there was a tremendous lack of knowledge among county officials about GIS. Erik H. seconded Duane's comment about the level of interest. Erik noted that numerous officials stopped by the booth and were very interested in seeing a demonstration of the capabilities of a GIS. He noted that a common question was "how much does it cost." Erik indicated that from his conversations with people, it was apparent that there is a considerable need for education. Cliff W. seconded Duane S. and Erik H.'s assessment about the need for education of local government officials about GIS. Terry K. reported that NRC also had a booth at the Convention to display their DOQQs and had identified some new interest in the product from groups like weed boards.

Jon O. raised the question of asking the Educational Subcmte. to develop ideas for providing additional opportunities for GIS demonstrations and education targeted to local government officials. The regional meetings of NACO were mentioned as possibilities or being prepared to respond to invitations from requesting counties. Terry K. suggested the possibility of mobile GIS training sessions. It was noted that currently the Educational Subcmte. consist of only Jim M. and Larry Z. Jon O. and Terry K. expressed a willingness to participate in an ad hoc meeting to at least discuss ideas if Jim M. would call the meeting.

Expenses Incurred at the NACO Convention. Larry Z. reported that he needed guidance on how the Str. Cmte. wished to handle expenses incurred in relation to the Str. Cmte. efforts at the NACO Convention. Larry Z. reported that Duane S. expenses totalling \$565.35 for his travel, lodging and food related to the Convention. Larry Z. also reported that Erik H. had similar expenses, although less travel.

Larry Z. suggested that as the Str. Cmte. considers these specific expenses it should probably also consider some other travel expenses and its available budget for this type of expense. Larry Z. noted that Dennis Wilson had inquired about how he should handle expenses he has incurred for his travel related to planning for the GIS Symposium. Jim B. indicated that those expenses should be submitted to the Symposium Planning Committee and not the GIS Str. Cmte. Larry Z. also noted that the Str. Cmte. has approximately \$3,000 available for Str. Cmte. expenses. Larry Z. noted that as of October 31st, approximately 26% of that had been spent. Larry Z. said that last year it required almost all of this \$3,000 fund to cover Duane S.'s travel expenses from Scottsbluff for the year. Larry Z. indicated, that in previous years, other Str. Cmte. expenses were covered by funds that are no longer available to the Str. Cmte. It was noted in the discussion that the Str. Cmte. has been moving to fewer meetings and that this would impact the meeting expenses. It was suggested that the Str. Cmte. pay these NACO Convention related expenses and more closely monitor this budget in the future.

Tom Ryan moved, Cliff W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. reimburse Duane Stott for his expenses related to providing a demo at the Str. Cmte.'s booth and breakout session at the NACO Annual Convention this year. The motion passed on a vote of eleven "for" and Duane Stott "not voting" (*see vote # 5 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

Terry K. moved, and Cliff W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. invite the Lancaster County Assessor's Office to invoice the Str. Cmte. for Erik Hubl's expenses related his participation in GIS Str. Cmte.'s booth at the NACO Annual Convention, and that the Str. Cmte. pay for those invoiced expenses. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote #6 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

Jim B. moved, Jon O. seconded, that Rod A. be authorized to approve and process for payment, on behalf of the Str. Cmte., any necessary and ordinary future expenditures related to the Str. Cmte.'s activities and report those actions to the Str. Cmte. for its approval at its next meeting. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote #7 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

UPDATE ON NEBRASKA NSDI CLEARINGHOUSE AND GEOSPATIAL METADATA INITIATIVE. Larry Z. noted that at the Str. Cmte.'s last meeting the relative merits of selecting a subset of the standard metadata fields was discussed, and the Clearinghouse Working Group was urged to consider that possibility. Larry Z. reported that the Working Group decided that there was enough flexibility built into the metadata standards that investing in selecting a subset was probably not a worthwhile exercise. Larry Z. also reported that the group is currently working with a wordprocessing metadata templet and urging agency personnel to begin creating metadata. Larry Z. reported that at this time, NRC had done the most in the way of creating metadata that meets FGDC standards. Larry Z. noted that the challenge at this time is working with agency personnel to learn the metadata standards and to allocate the time to develop the metadata for existing coverages. Larry Z. also reported that Steve Jonas, Nebr. Library Commission, had developed a very rough web site page, using the searchable Clearinghouse software and the existing metadata from the pilot project. The address for that web page is: <http://nlcnews.nlc.state.ne.us>.

UPDATE ON PLANS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIGITAL COUNTY SOIL SURVEYS.

Jim M. passed out to the Str. Cmte. a memo from Perry Wigley, Director of Conservation and Survey Division - UNL (*attached to minutes, Addendum #1*). The memo outlined the Division's perspective on current discussions related to the development of digital soils data and DOQQs. Jim M. indicated that Mark Kuzila, CSD Soil Scientist, was interested in meeting again with the Str. Cmte. to discuss digital soils work, but that he could not make the current meeting.

Terry K. reported that NRC is still negotiating with CSD and NRCS for an agreement on how the three entities will proceed with the development of digital county soil survey data. Terry noted that NRC has held up approval of a contract for \$150,000/yr. between NRC and CSD, for county soils work, pending an agreement on the soils digitization issue. Terry K. also reported that NRCS, at the national level, has signed off on the SSURGO standards for digitizing county soil surveys. Terry reported that it was his understanding that the finally adopted SSURGO standards will be very similar to the last draft that was circulated and will include a requirement to use either DOQQs or USGS 7.5 minute ortho-topos for a base map for recompiling soil lines prior to digitizing. Terry K. stated his recommendation that DOQQs on 2nd order DEMs be used to meet the SSURGO standards. Terry K. also passed out some material related to SSURGO standards (*attached to minutes, Addendum #2*).

REPORT ON NRC'S LANCASTER COUNTY DOQQ PILOT PROJECT. Terry K. reported that the USGS had recently returned a very positive evaluation of the Lancaster County DOQQs. Terry K. passed out material related to the Lancaster County DOQQ pilot project which included a discussion of the technical specifications of the products and processes; a proposed priority list of counties for a three-year development effort of DEMs and DOQQs statewide; a proposed breakdown of the time required for DEM, DOQQ and SSURGO production for the first year; a phased narrative describing the Lancaster County DOQQ project; a diagram outlining the development steps; a list of GIS Str. Cmte. members; and letter from USGS in Menlo Park, CA and Rolla, MO commending NRC on the quality of the work done on the Lancaster County DOQQs and DEMs respectively (*attached to minutes, addendum #3*). Terry noted that the first five counties listed on the priority counties for DOQQ production the first year should be removed from the list because DOQQs for those counties have already been ordered through USGS. Terry K. also passed out a set of letters NRC had received related to SSURGO or DOQQs (*attached to minutes, addendum #4*).

Terry K. was asked about the storage requirements for the DOQQs. Terry K. reported that each quarter quad required approximately 50 megabytes and to store the entire state would require approximately 315 gigabytes (*recorder not clear if this includes DEMs*). Terry K. was asked about the need for and use of the DOQQs statewide, given that the SSURGO soil standards allow for using either DOQQs or ortho-topos for base maps. Terry K. acknowledged that the SSURGO standards allow for the use of either base, but stated his opinion that the DOQQs would provide a better product. Terry K. stated that need for DOQQs was primarily for internal NRC agency applications, but that NRC would make them available to other agencies for other applications. Terry noted that NRC was proposing to produce DEMs and DOQQs for the entire state over a period of three years and within their agency budget for under one million dollars.

Larry Z. handed out to the Str. Cmte. a very rough initial draft of a pilot project report done by the State of Kansas to evaluate four variations of DOQQs for different state and local government applications. Larry Z emphasized that he had just received this very rough initial draft and that he finally convinced the Kansas folks to share with it with him based on the understanding it would receive very limited circulation until a more refined draft is available (*not attached to minutes for this reason*). Larry Z. indicated that he felt it was important for the Str. Cmte. to consider the utility of DOQQs for various applications, and the possibility of allowing for area specific variations in DOQQs

prior to acting on a proposal for statewide production of DOQQs. Terry K. noted that after an initial glance at the material, it appeared that Kansas was basing their evaluations on DOQQs with level 1 DEMs, and NRC was proposing to develop DOQQs based on level 2 DEMs.

Rod A. suggested that, as per Str. Cmte. adopted policy, the Str. Cmte. should act on NRC's proposal to develop statewide DOQQs within its next meeting or two. Rod A. also suggested that according to adopted Str. Cmte. policy, NRC needs to provide the Str. Cmte. with sufficiently detailed information about the proposal to facilitate that consideration and action. In an effort to move this process forward, Rod requested that NRC provide the Str. Cmte. with written responses to the following four general questions.

1. What are the major needs driving the development of DOQQs and how does the development sequence match these needs? Are there viable alternatives?
2. Does this have any impact on the committees priority projects (soils map development and land record modernization)?
3. Have all effected parties reviewed and agreed to the development plan and does the plan address the accuracy/standards to be met? Does the plan address how the DOQQs will be maintained?
4. Is there a need to search out cooperative funding for this project?

Terry K. indicated that NRC would provide written responses to the four questions.

UPDATE ON THE 1996 NEBRASKA GIS SYMPOSIUM. Jim Merchant gave the Str. Cmte. a brief overview of the current planning for the Symposium. Jim noted that he felt it was coming together pretty well, but that there was still a need for some additional presenters. Jim M. noted that the Symposium will feature the following speakers:

Bill Holland, past President of the National States Geographic Information Council and former head of Wisconsin's Land Information Board,
Nancy Tosta, Director of the Federal Geographic Data Committee,
Ed Cranc, M.J. Harden Associates (GIS and local government consultants) of Kansas City, and
Kathy Peckman, County Clerk of Miami County Kansas.

CO-SPONSORSHIP OF MID-AMERICA GIS SYMPOSIUM. Larry Z. reported that he had received an invitation from the MidAmerica GIS Consortium to be a co-sponsor of the 1996 MidAmerica GIS Symposium. Larry noted that there were three categories of co-sponsorship from which the Str. Cmte. could choose (advocate, benefactor, or program) and that only the benefactor category involved a fund transfer. Jim M. noted that the Str. Cmte. qualifies for the "program" category already due to his participation in the planning committee. Larry Z. also reported that he had been asked informally to participate in a panel of state coordinators at the Symposium. Jim M. also noted that while the "benefactor" category does involve a fee of \$200, it also includes two individual registrations to the Symposium. Jim suggested that if Larry Z. and someone else is going, that it would be cheaper to become a "benefactor" co-sponsor. Following discussion, Jim M. moved, Jon O. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. accept the invitation to co-sponsor the 1996 MidAmerica Symposium at the "PROGRAM" level of sponsorship and leave open until the next meeting the possibility of the "BENEFACTOR" level of sponsorship. This question was deferred until the next meeting to allow for more clarity on Str. Cmte. budgetary matters. The motion passed unanimously (*see vote # 8 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

WISCONSIN UPLINK. Larry Z. noted that he had received information from the State of Wisconsin on a satellite conference on land record modernization planned for April 11, 1996. Larry Z. noted that there will be a \$250 per site fee for a downlink, and that this includes a set of reproducible materials and guide. Larry Z. asked Duane S. to share his experience with arranging for a downlink site on a previous occasion. Duane reported that while he felt the previous session provided good information, the presentation was very dry. Duane indicated that he would not be very enthusiastic about the potential of this proposed satellite session to generate much enthusiasm among local government officials. Based on Duane's reflections, the Str. Cmte. decided to not pursue organizing a downlink site, however John M. indicated that he might explore doing so for Saunders County.

UPDATE ON GPS BASE STATION. Jim B. indicated that he had nothing new to report at this time.

STR. CMTE. MEMBERS UPDATES ON THEIR AGENCY GIS ACTIVITIES. Jon O. reported that NDOR has been doing some work on translating spatial coverages between Intergraph and ArcInfo formats. Jon indicated that they were successful going one-way, he was sure which way and that there is software on the way to facilitate the translation the other way.

Terry K. reported that through cooperator agreements with some federal agencies, NRC will be able to access Landsat databases at no charge.

OTHER BUSINESS. Rod A. raised the possibility of cancelling the scheduled December Str. Cmte. meeting. There was general support for this proposal. Larry Z. raised the question of any problems with delaying the Str. Cmte.'s action on NRC's DOQQ proposal, but no concerns were expressed. Therefore it was decided to cancel the scheduled December meeting and to meet next on January 17th. Rod noted that at that meeting the Str. Cmte. will begin a formal process of reviewing NRC's statewide DOQQ development proposal. Terry K. suggested that if the Str. Cmte. was going to review the DOQQ proposal, that it should also review a SSURGO soils proposal and invite CSD and NRCS participation along with NRC's. No objections were offered to this suggestion. The meeting was adjourned.

TO DO LIST.

NRC - will provide the GIS Str. Cmte. with written responses to the general questions related to the proposed statewide DOQQ project to facilitate the Str. Cmte.'s review and action on the proposal.

Larry Z. - will notify the MidAmerica Symposium planning committee that the Str. Cmte. will be a "PROGRAM" level co-sponsor of the Symposium and will consider in January the possibility of a "BENEFACTOR" sponsorship.

GIS Steering Committee
VOTING RECORD

Date 11/15/95

	Attendance	Revisé Minutes	Approve Minutes As Dict.	Reconides Minutes Vote	Amend Minutes	Approve Minutes as Amended	Duane's NACG expenses	Erik's NACG expenses	Rod's Expense Authority	Mid America
		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9
DAS - Rod Armstrong	P	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DEQ - Dennis Burling Tom Lamberson	P	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	+	+	+	+
CSD - Perry Wigley Les Howard, Jim Merchant	P	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NRC - Dayle Williamson Terry Kubicek	P	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PRO - Tom Ryan	P	NV	NV	+	NV	NV	+	+	+	+
DOR - Jon Ogden	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Surveyor - Jim Brown	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LRD - Laura Valenziano Val Goodman	A/P			+	+	+	+	+	+	+
John Miyoshi	A/P			NV	+	+	+	+	+	+
Blaine Dinwiddie	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	A									
Lash Chaffin	A									
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+	NV	+	+	+
Dennis Wilson	A									
TOTALS	10-P 12-P	6(+) 2(-) 2(NV)	7(+) 1(-) 2(NV)	10(+) 2(NV)	10(+) 2(NV)	10(+) 2(NV)	11(+) 1-NV	12(+)	12(+)	12(+)

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