

Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes -- November 30, 2000

Present were (authorized to vote +):

Mahendra Bansal		Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Jim Brown	+	State Surveyor
Blaine Dinwiddie	+	Omaha Public Power District
Dick Genrich	+	Department of Roads
Dan Hoffman	+	Policy Research Office
Ed Kelley		League of Municipalities
Mark Kuzila	+	Conservation and Survey Division - UNL
Tom Lamberson	+	Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality
Bob Martin	+	Department of Property Assessment and Taxation
Scott McIntyre	+	City of Omaha
Jim Merchant		Conservation and Survey Division - University of Nebraska Lincoln
John Miyoshi	+	Lower Platte North NRD
Dick Nelson	+	Nebraska Health and Human Services
Steve Peaslee	+	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Scott Richert		Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Steve Schafer	+	Chief Information Officer
Duane Stott	+	Scottsbluff County
Cliff Welsh	+	NACO
Dayle Williamson	+	Department of Natural Resources
Larry Worrell	+	Lancaster County
Paul Yamamoto	+	Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality
Larry Zink		GIS Steering Committee Coordinator

Complete Meeting Agenda

MAJOR MEETING TOPICS

Local Government Guidelines

LB 628

Community IT Grant Applications

Technical Assistance for Local Government

Voting Record

Symposium Co-sponsorship

Strategic Plan Follow-up - Databases

OMB Initiative

Relationship of Key Infrastructure Components

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, November 22, 2000.

ROLL CALL: Vice Chairperson Mark Kuzila called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 pm. Thirteen duly authorized representatives were present at the time of the roll call. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER: Larry Zink introduced Scott McIntyre as the replacement member for Dennis Wilson who has taken a position with the Mayor's office and is no longer available for Steering Committee meetings. Scott will be filling a member-at-large position. Scott has also been named to Dennis Wilson's former position with the Public Works Dept., City of Omaha.

MINUTES: Vice Chairperson Mark Kuzila requested a motion to approve the minutes from the September 7 and the September 22 meetings. Dayle made the motion and Steve Schafer seconded. No discussion was desired. Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed. (see vote #1 on Voting Record sheet).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT MULTIPURPOSE LAND INFORMATION SYSTEMS:

Larry explained that the Steering Committee has already approved the core sections that were the Committee's primary goal and that they are working on a few supplemental sections right now. Larry indicated that he hoped that some of these will be available for Steering Committee review at its next meeting.

COSPONSORSHIP OF 2001 NEBRASKA GIS SYMPOSIUM: Larry explained that in the past, the Steering Committee has been the main sponsor and responsible for organizing and hosting this event but now the GIS/LIS Association has taken over the task. The Committee has already agreed to be a cosponsor in name but there is an additional question of whether to extend financial assistance.

Dayle moved to allocate the \$200 sponsorship donation. Cliff seconded. There was no further discussion. Larry called the roll and the motion passed (*see vote #2 on Voting Record sheet*).

RESCHEDULING MAY 31 MEETING: Larry requested the May 31 meeting be rescheduled as he has a personal conflict with that date. He suggested possible alternatives as being the afternoon of May 10 immediately following the GIS symposium, the morning of May 11 or the afternoon of June 7. The value of holding the meeting on the afternoon of May 10 is that those Committee members who have to travel long distances can avoid having to do so twice in one month. Mark suggested reserving space at the Cornhusker to hold the meeting rather than having it at Roads. The Committee agreed to the date and location change.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOLLOWUP: Larry said that Steve Schafer suggested the Steering Committee look into doing some prioritization of core database development to facilitate a presentation about the Strategic Plan to the NITC in January. Steve explained that prioritization was particularly useful to policy makers when dealing in terms of limited resources, such as Larry's time.

Larry said that in the past there has been discussion about prioritization but the Committee has never been able to settle on numeric categories to delineate relative importance. However, there are other possible categories for prioritization that the Committee has used several times before in ranking projects of similar importance. These categories include

- Highly recommended
- Recommended
- Neutral
- Concerns/opposition

Mark asked what the Committee's reaction would be if asked to give specific rankings right now and whether it is feasible to ask members to place one database above another. Another question is how do you agree on the relative importance of the various databases. Duane asked if the results of previous efforts at prioritization were available. Larry said the only time this was addressed before was when the GIS Steering Committee was reviewing agency project proposals for the NITC. That involved the Surface Water database, the DOQs, and the DEMs. At the time, the surface water database was ranked as highly recommended while the other two were classed as recommended projects.

Dayle noted that the setting of priorities doesn't make a big impact on the practical reality of the situation. There are a number of databases already in the process of being developed and those projects will continue, regardless of the results of Steering Committee prioritization.

Steve Schafer asked what databases do not already have a sponsor and adequate funding. Larry said that the most problematic database in terms of having a sponsor is the surface water database. It is an important part of the data infrastructure with a multitude of potential users but no obvious one main, lead agency. A pilot project in one watershed is currently underway, but there is no clear organizational/funding roadmap for statewide development and it could use additional assistance and coordination. The public land survey system is another big project with major organizational and funding questions. While it has some leadership from the State Surveyor's office and some support from the Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation, there is at this time no coordinated plan to complete the project.

Steve said that rather than try to directly prioritize the development of databases, a better approach might be to determine where the Steering Committee's efforts would have the most impact. Hypothetically speaking, if the Steering Committee were to have money available to spend in this area, where would they allocate those resources.

Cliff suggested that individual agencies in the process of developing databases of interest to many parties might be able to leverage their resources more effectively by contacting the interested parties and working together to develop it. Of course work will continue on the respective databases whether other agencies are interested or not but such cost sharing efforts permit faster development. Larry agreed and pointed out that all the databases on the GIS Steering Committee list were of interest to multiple agencies.

Mark said that if the Steering Committee agreed to place one database above another in terms of importance, then that is where the money should go rather than spreading the money out to a number of different databases. Larry noted that it may not be realistic for the Steering Committee to do this but the Committee has asked for some responsibility in this area with its call for a Collaborative Database Development Fund and no one else is better suited to make this kind of assessment.

Dayle said that of those databases not yet in progress, DNR would rate the development of the surface water database as being of greatest interest and highest priority. However, no arguments have been presented for the other databases. Mark asked if it would bother him for available money to be spent on databases other than something like the DOQ/DEM database. Dayle said that database will be complete within three years and they are comfortable with that timeline.

Duane said that they need to have some sort of idea what the potential is for funding within each agency before doing anything. For some of them, if the right persuasion is made, it might be possible to obtain funding from other sources.

Larry noted that the Steering Committee is scheduled to give a presentation before the NITC in January and that this provides an opportunity to highlight one or two particular areas of need if there is a rough consensus within the Steering Committee. Larry suggested that one process option to facilitate a prioritization effort might be to assume the Steering Committee has a fixed amount of money to allocate, like \$250,000 and determine what the best allocation of these funds would be.

Jim Brown commented that the operation of the collaborative database fund requested by the Steering Committee will likely be much like obtaining Federal Funds. Frequently, acquiring such funds is dependent on what other agencies can be found to be partners on the project and where it can be most effectively leveraged. It isn't possible to designate any one of the databases as more important than another because they are all important to one agency or another. However, if one agency has money to put toward developing a particular database, then additional money is better spent working toward the completion of that database.

Dick Nelson commented that an other scenario to consider is that most of the databases are moving along with a timetable for completion with some assurance of funding and it would be good to get those things done first rather than putting money into something that has no funding. Larry asked if completion of the roads database could be sped up by the addition of more money. Dick Genrich said that it is more a matter of personnel. Additional money toward a project is good but doesn't help if the people are not available to work on the project.

Steve asked how difficult it would be to create a summary of who the sponsor is for each database along with a rough timeframe for completion, what issues exist and a general cost for completion. Larry said that information is all in the Strategic Plan. Scott said that the problem seems to lie in an inability to make qualitative judgements and compare databases that cannot be compared. It is a matter of perspective. If there was an assessment of the databases along with a list of which agencies would access each database, that would avoid the subjective comparison issue. Larry pointed out that the comparison is in the Strategic Plan, the question is whether the Committee wants to go beyond that to make specific priority rankings.

Steve Schafer asked if it would be useful to have the sponsors' of these database development efforts report to the Steering Committee about their progress. Larry said that reports are made to the Steering Committee, with the exception of the street address database, the surface water database and the public land survey/property parcel databases, which have no clear sponsor. Dayle said that development efforts are not always clear, especially when multiple agencies are involved and it is sometimes difficult to ascertain what progress is being made.

Steve Schafer said he would like to take a structured approach at the next meeting and go through the list of potential databases to discuss who the sponsor is, what progress has been made, what the timelines are etc. This body needs to send the message that they have a good understanding of what needs to be accomplished in the short term. Larry said that the Steering Committee's message seems to be twofold; first, additional resources are needed and second, the Steering Committee is an effective body to help allocate those resources.

Steve Peaslee added that another direction to attack the problem would be to assume that there is a certain amount of money available and have proponents of each database 'apply' for the funds by drafting a proposal. Mark pointed out that unallocated money appearing wasn't a very reasonable scenario. It is more likely to become available as the result of a specific request.

The issue will be discussed at the next meeting with a request to Larry Zink to prepare a short summary of the current status of priority databases.

DISCUSSION OF LB628. Dan Hoffman introduced Dave Comer from the Attorney General's office, as the person who is contacted when citizens have questions about public records. He is attending the meeting in order to address the ramifications of LB 628. This bill was introduced by Senator Brashear during the last session. The most relevant part of this bill is section one, the

discussion of public record availability.

Dave drafted an outline detailing the major provisions of this new statute and what it requires public bodies and agencies to do. Prior to the passage of LB 628, the Attorney General's office took the stand that the public records statutes did not require public bodies to make copies of those records, only that they provide citizen access to them. That has changed with LB 628 and the Attorney General has been given enforcement authority. That means that any citizen who believes an agency has denied them access to legitimate public records can bring the case to the Attorney General to review and possibly prosecute. Because of this, they have established a set of guideline to reflect that enforcement authority.

Prior to LB628, the Attorney General's stand was that the statutes required agencies to give citizens access to public records. That meant that you could come in during normal business hours and request documents to view and make notes of. There was some disagreement with that policy and the statutes were amended to change it. What the statutes now state is that citizens have the right to make copies of public records on the premises of the custodial agency or some location that has been mutually agreed upon. They also have the statutory right to obtain copies of public records in any form in which the record is maintained or produced. This includes photocopies, print outs, electronic data, disks, and tapes.

Copies can be obtained only if the custodian has copy equipment reasonably available. The Attorney General is already seeing questions coming up from these policies. For example, a citizen wanted a copy of a tape from a meeting but the agency did not have a dubbing machine available. That meant that the agency was not obligated to provide a copy.

The statute also states that if copying the material in question would violate copyright laws, then the agency is not obligated to make copies.

The Attorney General's office has received numerous questions regarding what is meant by actual cost. The statutes state that the custodian of a public record may charge a fee for providing copies of that record, which shall not exceed the actual cost of making the copies available. The statutes further define actual cost in certain circumstances. Photocopies shall not exceed the amount of the reasonably calculated actual cost of the photocopy. Print outs and computerized data on paper shall include the reasonably calculated actual costs of computer run time and cost materials for making copies. For electronic data, the actual cost of making copies available shall include reasonably calculated actual costs of computer run time, any necessary analysis of programming and the production of the report in the form furnished to the requestor.

One of the problems with this bill is that it treats all citizen requests for information in the same fashion. A request from an individual requesting six pages of minutes from the local board meetings is treated the same as an attorney working on a lawsuit who is using these statutes for discovery. The legislative history of this bill makes it very clear that the senators intended for agencies to be able to recover costs for time spent in finding and making copies of documents. Because of this, the Attorney General's office is allowing agencies to charge a reasonable amount for personnel time for large-scale requests. However, if an agency chooses to add this type of a fee in, it needs to be prepared to defend it in court.

Access to state records online is still possible and the State Records Board governs charges for those records.

A public body is not required to produce or generate any public record in a new or different format than that of the original record.

If a voluminous records request is received and the public body, in good faith, estimates that it will cost more than fifty dollars, then the body has the right to request a fifty dollar deposit.

Upon receipt of a written request for access to or copies of public records, the custodian of those records is required to do one of the following things within four business days.

- a. Give the requestor access to the records or give them the copies of the requested records.
- b. If there is a legal basis for denial of access to or copies of the records, as the statutes do allow for some categories of public records to remain confidential. That includes things like investigatory records, library cards, and medical records. If someone requests copies of those records, the custodial agency is required to provide them with a denial letter within four days that lists the specific statute that protects the records, the official responsible for making the decision to keep the records confidential, and notification of any administrative or judicial right of review. That basically tells them that they have legal recourse
- c. If the entire request cannot be fulfilled in four days with reasonable effort taken due to significant difficulty or the extensiveness of the request, a written explanation must be sent detailing the earliest practical date for fulfilling the request along with an estimate of the cost of the copies. This will allow the requestor to modify their request if

desired.

d. If a delay is necessary, it will generally be the result of one of two things. Either the request is so large it cannot be completed within the allotted four-day period or the custodial agency needs to obtain legal advice with respect to the confidentiality of the documents requested.

That is a summary of what the bill says. Dave asked for any questions, keeping in mind that this is new legislation and there is very little case law behind it.

Dayle Williamson commented that they have had a County Attorney ask for email records. Dave said that email records are routinely included in discovery and is one of the hot areas of litigation. People seem to forget that they are leaving a permanent record with email. There are even ways to recover deleted mail.

Steve Schafer asked if the responsibility to provide public records included changing the format the records are in. Dave said that if it is a matter of converting something like a Word document to a WordPerfect document, it would not be required. If it is a matter of saving a file from the computer to a disk, then it is required. The rudimentary act of duplicating the data is mandated by statute. The question of what that constitutes really depends on what steps are required, how much manipulation is needed and how great the change in format is. At this point there is nothing in legislative history to shed any light on that.

Larry said that most of the Steering Committee members are custodians of large, computerized databases that required a great deal of money to create and maintain. There has been a trend, particularly at the local level, to charge a fees for that data as a means to generate funds to maintain that data as opposed to giving it away to private enterprises who would repackage the data and sell it. Some local governments even have statutes allowing that sort of activity. Are they still permitted to charge for that data? Dave said that if they already have statutes in place that speak specifically to charging for a particular database, then the specific statute would take precedence. Otherwise, that database may be requested and must be provided at cost. Protection for that kind of database really doesn't exist anymore unless it is specifically stated in statute. Later discussion noted the distinction between state statutes and local government-based code, laws or regulations and that these probably do not take precedence over the public records statutes outlined in LB 628.

Duane commented that development of GIS databases is not something that is required of any government agency. If the end result of this legislation is that a real estate company can come in after the county has spent thousands of dollars developing a comprehensive database and download the entire thing for .20 of computer time, this information will not be obtained. Dave commented that there was no policy decision made to deny local government the right to charge for such things. There is also the argument that this information has been developed using taxpayer money and the taxpayers should not have to pay twice for it. Duane said that if the agency spends taxpayer money to develop a database and a tiny percentage of the people are allowed to take that database and use it to make money, then the remainder of the population who also contributed toward creating the database, will wind up gaining nothing.

Steve Schafer asked if it would be possible for an agency wanting to recover some of its costs to establish a fee for the documents by going through the State Records Board. Dave said that the ability to charge for public records extends only to online access and still compels the custodial agency to provide the same records for reproduction costs if the requestor comes to the office in person. People want information and have basically determined that government has commercially viable information.

Scott McIntyre said that a lot of agencies have developed databases for their own, internal use and are not staffed to respond to requests from the public. The fees charged by his office for public data are not there as a means of recovering costs; they charge fees for their data to discourage people from casual requests. Dave said that his concern with that is at that point, the Attorney General's office may become involved as an arbiter or the requestor may choose to sue the custodial agency for non-compliance. Scott clarified that he was not advocating non-compliance. Dave said that agencies need to be able to justify the amount they are charging for fees in court.

This legislation does not require any agency to hire additional staff, but it can mean the addition of temporary personnel, the cost of which can be passed on to the records requestor as part of the cost of reproduction. Jim Brown pointed out that an additional issue is that a lot of state agencies are not equipped to take money and any sale requires the sales tax to be paid. Dave agreed that there are agencies that have had to adjust to this. The DEQ has had to redirect the activities of three full time staff people to handle records requests.

Larry asked about privacy concerns. Dave said that in his time with the Attorney General's office, he has observed that most of the public records statutes in this area are geared toward disclosure and availability of information. Part of the reason for that is that the proponents and strongest advocates are media people. What that means is that there are a lot of statutes that give the public right of access to information. The other side of the coin is that privacy issues have received little concern. The emphasis has

always been that the public needs to see government records. There are some things protected under federal law, such as social security numbers, political records, student records, personal information of public employees etc. but from the standpoint of a citizen, there simply isn't much protection.

John Miyoshi asked if a fee would be acceptable should you choose to copyright the material. Dave said that this statute does not intend for agencies to violate copyright laws but that is basically designed to protect things like software programs and the like. Additionally, the government has a limited capacity to copyright documents.

POSSIBLE COMMUNITY COUNCIL GRANT IT APPLICATIONS. The Community Council has \$270,000 available for which grant preposals are due in January. The Steering Committee has stated its need for additional funds and therefore it would be appropriate to apply for the ones available. Of the available funds, the state collaborative fund appears to be more appropriate for the Steering Committee's projects which include two proposed possibilities, the National Hydrography Database and the PLSS. A one-page preposal is due early in January and the actual grant application in mid-February.

Mark asked if anyone will have time to put together a proposal by that time. Steve said that the pre-proposals are due January 12, the application is due February 16. Mark asked what role the Steering Committee would have in that decision-making process since the NHD advisory committee and the PLSS advisory committee should be responsible for doing this. Larry said that the Steering Committee would provide an endorsement of the projects. Larry spoke with Jim Brown regarding the PLSS application and the possibility of one of the counties applying for the grant. Mark asked if there were any counties interested in doing that. Jim said there was a county interested.

Jim said that there was no reason to take any action before the deadline. The State Surveyor's office will be applying for the grant anyway, but it would be nice to have the support and endorsement of the Steering Committee.

Mark said that if anyone is interested in applying for NITC funds, they need to be prepared by January 4 for the Steering Committee to review their request.

BECOMING AN IMPLEMENTATION TEAM (I-TEAM) IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE OMB INIATIVE. Larry reported that until recently, the main federal coordination player in GIS has been the FGDC, an interagency body created by executive order. The FGDC did a lot of things but did not have much in terms of enforcement power. OMB is becoming interested in GIS, in part because of presentations from the FGDC. So far, it is very fluid and not very well defined, but they are soliciting input from states and locality about things that are being done on framework databases. They will be looking at that and directing federal agencies to work with state and local entities to make these things happen. They are requesting a fairly ambitious report be complete by the middle of January.

Larry recommended that if resources allow, it would probably be good that the Steering Committee submit something and see where it goes. Mark suggested that if Larry has the time he develop a draft and bring it back for the next meeting.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Larry explained that this topic seemed to need more discussion than was possible at the last meeting. To assist with that discussion, Larry provided the Steering Committee with a brief historical perspective on the Steering Committee efforts in this regard.

This historical perspective began with the Steering Committee first recognizing Land Records Modernization as a priority 1995. In response to that, the Steering Committee formed an intergovernmental Property Parcels Task Force who researched the issues and ultimately published a Working Paper in 1996. That paper laid out a number of things that needed to be done. This Working Paper has since been the basic blueprint from which the Steering Committee has been working.

In response to one of those recommendations, the Steering Committee formed a PLSS Advisory Committee, which drafted and issued a PLSS pilot project proposal to all the counties and NRDs about creating a PLSS layer using BLM software. As a result of this proposal, the State Surveyor's office completed a PLSS pilot project in three counties.

The Working Paper also called for some standards and the Steering Committee created an Advisory Committee for that purpose. The main portion of those standards has been completed and approved by the Steering Committee as a result of the work of the current Advisory Committee on Standards for Multipurpose Land Information Systems.

Another recommendation called for standards in statute. The Steering Committee worked with the Legislature, who placed in statute language defining the Nebraska Plane Coordinate System in 1998. The same bill gave the State Surveyor's office increased authority to work with local governments and two staff people to help address that need.

This year, the Steering Committee forwarded some recommendations to the NITC relating to Land Records Modernization. Those

recommendations were incorporated into the Statewide Technology Plan. The Land Records Modernization Advisory Committee was formed this year as well, consisting of Jim Brown, Cliff Welsh, Larry Zink and Duane Stott. It was this group that came forward with the regional professional service center concept and reported it to the Steering Committee this spring.

The Steering Committee also discussed in March of this year, a draft resolution calling for state and local partnerships. There was a general consensus that this step is needed, but the resolution itself was tabled pending further dialogue with the administration, via PRO.

A delegation was sent to the Western Governor's Cadastral forum in March and that group came out with strong recommendations urging state, federal and local cooperation in the development and maintenance of cadastral data and the Western Governors later endorsed these recommendations in the form of a resolution.

Larry noted that there has been quite a bit of work and progress made in this area, however there has not been much progress being made on one major component that was recommended in the 1996 Working Paper, state and local partnerships. It seems that the Steering Committee has concluded that if rural communities were ever going to succeed in land records modernization, state and local partnerships were a necessity.

The wording that went into the Statewide Technology Plan was 'develop and adopt a strategy to facilitate the modernization of local government land information systems addressing the needs of compatibility across jurisdictional boundaries and adequate funding'. The Strategic Plan stated that the Steering Committee needed to develop an intergovernmental model with the major challenge being to engage the various stakeholders in a collaborative process and develop a rough consensus around an intergovernmental model that can facilitate cooperative development and ongoing maintenance of this core infrastructure database. Such a process will likely lead to making recommendations that will involve legislation and funding issues. The success of such a proposal will involve the Executive and Legislative branches as well as key associations.

The question is where does the Steering Committee want to go with this issue. The Strategic Plan clearly calls for dialogue around an intergovernmental model and there is a rough proposal from the Land Records Modernization Committee to explore the idea of regional mapping centers. Other than raising the importance of this issue, the Steering Committee has not taken any official position in this matter.

Duane pointed out that having the Steering Committee's backing would strengthen his and Cliff's presentation to NACO. Duane Stott moved to adopt the draft resolution that states completion of this database is important, if it is to be completed, state and local partnerships must occur, funding sources need to be explored, and raises the Wisconsin model as one option. John Miyoshi seconded.

Steve suggested that in section two, the statement 'state government should be an active partner in this modernization process to help insure that the necessary financial and technical resources are available...' implies that the state will be shouldering the bulk of the financial and technical burden for this process. The Committee agreed to change the section to read:

"Local governments must play a leading role in this modernization of land records. State government should be an active partner in this modernization process. State and local governments will cooperate to insure that the necessary financial and technical resources are available to local governments and that standards are applied so that the data developed are compatible across jurisdictional lines."

The motion to adopt the resolution as amended passed. (see vote #3 on Voting Record sheet).

RELATIONSHIP OF KEY SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANIZATIONAL/POLICY COMPONENTS.

Larry explained that in the GIS Strategic Plan the Steering Committee has called for dialogue with policy makers to make them aware of emerging GIS organizational/policy needs and has outlined several possible approaches for addressing those needs. As this dialogue begins, it helpful for the Committee to step back and look at how the various pieces might fit together. While the entire package may not all come through, one or two pieces might and the people who are responsible for moving forward with those pieces could benefit from the Steering Committee's perspective on how the the pieces might optimally fit together. In an attempt to stimulate this dialogue, Larry offered a diagram illustrating the relationships between the proposed components.

Mark observed that the diagram basically illustrates how every piece of the key spatial data relates to one another. Larry agreed. As an example of the questions, Larry stated if a GIS service center were to come into existence, what interaction does the Steering Committee want to have with this center? Or if the collaborative database development fund is created, where should that be based? Where should the clearinghouse be based? Either the Steering Committee will have a hand in shaping the future or someone else will.

Mark asked what Larry expected the Steering Committee to do with this today. Larry said no specific action is needed today, but he would like to have some idea of how the Steering Committee sees these pieces coming together in the future so that he has that background when he meets with the NITC and other policy makers.

Tom Lamberson commented that in looking at the diagram, he does not know what the questions are. Jim Brown clarified that the question is if the Steering Committee accomplished some of their goals, how would a Regional Professional Center be created and where would it be housed. Currently, the GIS Steering Committee coordinator is housed in DAS because that is where a spot could be found for him, the geospatial data clearinghouse is located in the library because that is where a space could be found. Up to this point, Steering Committee initiatives have been accomplished without much in the way of planning and that needs to change. Larry added an additional question is what relationship does the Steering Committee want to have with the NITC, the various Councils and the CIO's office.

Mark pointed out that if we receive money to fund Steering Committee initiatives, then the Committee will be having the same discussion in a year. Larry said that discussion about where a Regional Professional might reside are already occurring without the benefit of Steering Committee guidance. If the Steering Committee waits a year to have these discussions then any suggestions they might have will likely be irrelevant. There is a lot of wisdom on the Steering Committee and they are the best source of guidance in these matters if there is enough interest in taking a leading role.

Steve Schafer said that he has been trying pull the efforts of the GIS Steering Committee into those of the NITC structure. The GIS Steering Committee was one of the oldest coordinating entities created by the legislature. In 1998, the Legislature created a new, far more comprehensive process for trying to coordinate information technology. There was some discussion at the time about what to do with the existing Committees, whether they would be discarded and eliminated from statute or whether they would be incorporated into the NITC. Steve argued for maintaining the old, existing committees during the transition period. The new structure is in place now and the question becomes what is the best way of pulling the efforts of the existing entities together so that what they are doing is connected with the NITC's efforts.

Specifically, work on local government multipurpose land information systems provides a template for people to follow in moving forward on modernization. That relates closely to what the Technical Panel is working on, defining the overall architecture for technical standards. It is very relevant for that group to be aware of the Land Records Modernization standards. It is a clear demonstration that the Steering Committee's efforts are not isolated. In addition, the Community Council and that State Government Council could benefit from some of the activities the Steering Committee is involved in. Keeping this group connected to other structures is an important step.

Larry said that it is unlikely that specific answers will be forthcoming on this today but that it would be very needful if the Steering Committee would take some time to reflect on these issues and share the benefit of any consensus that might emerge. Blaine said that if you are really talking about addressing where some of these people fit in, the right people need to meet to discuss these issues. A regional professional center will likely wind up under the auspices of some state agency and the Steering Committee will not have much say in the matter.

Jim Brown said one thing to think about is how necessary is it that all these areas be connected. The original concept of GIS in Nebraska was separate but coordinated. The Steering Committee decided from its inception that a GIS tsar was not a desirable thing. Putting all these groups under one roof seems very much like reverting to a tsarist mentality. This is a concept that needs to be more homogenous before it is brought before the total group and that will take some time.

Mark asked if this activity means that at some point the GIS Steering Committee will become extinct, possible merging with the NITC. Steve Schafer said that was a possibility. The fundamental question is what the most effective way to accomplish the Steering Committee's goals.

Larry said the main question is how all these pieces fit together and relate to one another. Tom said that it is not clear what the specific questions are from the diagram. Larry explained that his intent with the diagram was to illustrate that however these items are placed institutionally, they need to relate to one another. He noted that from the discussion, it was clear that more work needs to be done to lay the ground for a Steering Committee discussion of these issues.

Due to the scope of the problem and the lateness of the hour, this issue will be on the next agenda. Steve Schafer suggested sending this to the Executive committee to discuss and identify and hone the pertinent questions.

DATABANK. Mahendra explained that the vast advancements in the information technology field have brought a lot of changes to the databank industry. PC power, the Internet, and GIS have changed the databank industry completely. It used to be that data was acquired from different state, federal and local agencies processed and disseminated to them. That is no longer relevant. At that time, static information was acceptable but now people are looking for dynamic data. They do not need basic or historic

information.

For GIS, the focus is on space data, not time or the changes in geography based on time. In the future, it will no longer be GIS; it will be space and time. GIS will come to mean Global Information Systems. For example, right now they are developing DOQs based on information from 1999 which is concentrated on space alone, the time is fixed. In the future, it will be possible to process DOQs from real time satellite data.

Mahendra indicated that in light of these changes, the DNR Databank is in the process of developing a new vision statement and comments on this would be welcome. Mahendra handed out the current revised draft. Larry Zink noted that many of the issues the revision of DNR Databank is raising are related to the organizational/policy issues raised in the GIS Strategic Plan. Larry suggested that a they could benefit from a common reflective process.

Mark asked for comments to be sent to Mahendra by February 1 so that it can be presented at the next Databank Advisory Committee meeting to assist them in creating a databank that will serve the needs of the future.

The meeting was adjourned.

Vote Tallies for 11/30/00 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting									
	Roll Call	Min. #1	Sympos Co-Spon #2	Local Gov't Tech. Assist #3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
DAS - Steve Schafer	P	+	+	+
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling, Paul Yamamoto	P	+	+	+
CSD - Mark Kuzila Jim Merchant, Jim Lacy	P	+	+	+
NGPC - Mele Koneya Bruce Sackett	A
NRC - Dayle Williamson Mahendra Bansal	P	+	+	+
PTD - Cathy Lang Bob Martin, Scott Gaines	P	+	+	+
PRO - Lauren Hill Dan Hoffman	P	+	+	+
DOR - Dick Genrich	P	+	+	+
St. Surv - Jim Brown	A/P	.	.	+
Nathan McCaleb, Steve Peasley	A/P	+	+	NV
John Miyoshi Doug Steinke	A/P	.	.	+
Blaine Dinwiddie Steve Larson	A/P	.	.	+
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	P	NV	+
Lash Chaffin	A
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+
Scott McIntyre	P	NV	+	+
Dick Nelson John Erickson	P	+	+	+
TOTALS	16 - P	11 + 2 NV	13 +	14 + 1 NV

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