

GIS COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 8, 2011, 1:00-3:30 p.m.
Nebraska Dept. of Roads- Main Auditorium
1500 Nebraska Hwy 2, Lincoln, Nebraska

MINUTES

ROLL CALL PRESENT (authorized to vote*):

Chad Boshart	*	NEMA/Military Dept.
Karis Bowen	*	DHHS
Rose Braun	*	Dept. of Roads
Lash Chaffin	*	League of Municipalities
Tim Cielocha	*	Public Power
Eric Herbert	*	NACO Representative
Jim Langtry	*	USGS
Josh Lear	*	Dept. of Natural Resources
Jeff McReynolds	*	City of Lincoln/Lancaster County
John Miyoshi	*	Lower Platte North NRD
Jim Ohmberger	*	Office of the CIO
Sudhir Ponnapan	*	Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
Mike Preston	*	GIS Professional Organization
Mike Schonlau	*	Douglas County/Omaha – At Large Rep
Milda Vaitkus	*	Conservation and Survey Division – UNL
Sue Vanicek	*	Public Service Commission

Others Present:

Larry Zink, GIS Council Coordinator; Office of the CIO/NITC; Jack Dohrman, GIS Workshop

ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE ATTENDEES, PUBLIC MEETINGS REGULATIONS AND POSTING OF THE SAME

Mr. Schonlau called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. There were 14 voting members present at the time of roll call. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on June 26, 2011 and agenda posted on GIS Council website Sep. 1, 2011.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 5/4/11 MEETING

Mr. Chaffin moved to approve the [May 4, 2011 minutes](#) as presented. Mr. McReynolds seconded. The [motion was approved unanimously on a roll call vote.](#)

[NEBRASKAMAP](#)

Mr. McReynolds provided a brief follow-up on efforts that were made to use the NebraskaMAP infrastructure to support the Missouri River flood emergency efforts. Those efforts were initially discussed at the previous Council meeting. McReynolds noted that while much of the preparatory work was completed to provide access to some key datasets, the final implementation was delayed by some security concerns raised by one of the data providers. Initial efforts were made to implement a security architecture that would address these data access/security concerns, but final implementation was not completed. In part, because the immediate need for data sharing had already been addressed. This sentiment was seconded by Mr. Schonlau (Douglas County), Mr. Herbert (Sarpy County) and Chad Boshart (NEMA), however all of them expressed support for proceeding with the implementation of these data access security protocols so this particular issue would not be a factor in future data sharing needs.

[State Records Board Grant Application](#). Mr. Zink reported that the Nebraska State Records Board had approved a second \$25,000 grant application for the NebraskaMAP project. Mr. Zink wrote this grant application on behalf of the OCIO, with the support of the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee. The application has been submitted to the Records Board on behalf of the Office of the CIO. The grant

request is for \$25,000, with roughly one-half of the grant request is to pay for annual software maintenance and the other half for hosting and technical support costs. Since awarding the grant, the ESRI annual software maintenance costs for the NebraskaMAP has been paid.

Mr. Schonlau and Mr. McReynolds introduced the [recommendation of the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee regarding the question of private versus state agency hosting of the NebraskaMAP](#). The recommendation was that some of the core services of the NebraskaMAP should be hosted by a state agency rather than solely by a private entity. The recommendation noted that while there was a unique and important roles for state agency hosted NebraskaMAP type services, the architecture of the geospatial data sharing network was a rather open architecture and private sector entities should be encouraged to participate and contribute to growing data sharing network. The recommendation also noted that the Committee did not wish to suggest that the private sector could not be contracted to provide technical support for state agency NebraskaMAP type services.

It was noted that this recommendation was in response to a request from the CIO that the GIS Council and the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee review and make recommendations regarding a proposal received from GIS Workshop to host a NebraskaMAP type service. This OCIO request was discussed at the March 2, 2011 GIS Council meeting and referred to the NebraskaMAP for its review and recommendation.

Mr. Cielocha asked if the members of the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee if they could provide some additional background on the decision and the process. It was noted that GIS Workshop provided a presentation to the NebraskaMAP Committee at the Committee's invitation. The Committee spent a considerable amount of time discussing the pros and cons of the multiple options possible relative to private hosting. Following all of these discussions, the Committee decided to vote on the question of private hosting versus state agency hosting and then explore the nuances of that choice depending on the outcome of the vote. The Committee voted strongly (12-4) in favor of a state agency hosting.

Among the issues and/or concerns raised in support of a state agency solution were the following (additional issues outlined in the recommendation paper):

- Reluctance of some current NebraskaMAP partners to share their data with private hosted system;
- Concerns about data security and maintaining restricted access to sensitive data among other potential data providers (e.g. recent Missouri River flooding and the need to host and serve some sensitive GIS/geospatial data that was provided by others on the condition of maintaining restricted access to the data);
- Investment already made in NebraskaMAP software and hardware with the potential for future cost savings as agencies consider utilizing the capabilities of this enterprise service and forego future agency-specific investments in hardware and software;
- Ability of collaborating partner public agencies to control the priorities and developmental direction of an enterprise-level state GIS portal and related services;
- Perceived lack of accountability for a potentially critical service when provided by the private sector without a contract and related fees;

The question was raised as to the Council's role at this point relative to the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee recommendation. It was noted that the CIO's request for a review and recommendation referred to both the GIS Council and the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee. Mr. Zink noted that the Partners Committee could forward its recommendation directly to the CIO. However, if the GIS Council concurred with that recommendation, the message to the CIO would be clearer if the recommendation was referred jointly by the Council and the Committee. It was suggested that since the Council had not had the opportunity to be briefed on the Partners Committee thinking prior to this meeting, that it would be good to defer a Council vote on this matter until the next Council meeting. It was decided to put the NebraskaMAP Partners Committee recommendation on the Council's Oct. meeting agenda.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Imagery. This Working Group has met once since the last GIS Council meeting. Mr. Schonlau noted that the Working Group has developed an initial [set of recommendations for indexing and processing historical imagery](#). A major topic of this last meeting was the future focus of the group. Among the suggestions were: a). a pilot project using historical Douglas County imagery to further explore the key parameters involved in processing historic imagery; b). developing recommendations for required process and/or support for collaborative imagery acquisition efforts like NIROC; and providing an input channel into the Strategic Planning process relative to aerial imagery. Among the Strategic Planning ideas discussed were:

- the need for some type of ability/authority to pool funds from multiple entities over multiple years to help fill the role that MAPA is currently providing;
- the need for staff/project management support to help facilitate planning and implementation of multi-agency efforts like NIROC; and
- a “sinking fund” –type authority to pool and maintain funds by provided by multiple state/local agencies in advance of, but dedicated to collaborative imagery acquisition.

The next meeting of the Work Group will be held on the afternoon of Sept. 22nd at the Papio NRD

Cadastral/Property Parcel. Mr. Zink noted that this Working Group has developed [draft guidelines to assist local governments as they move from shapefile format data to geodatabase format](#). The Working Group is now working to take these conceptual guidelines and test them by developing of an actual working database model. To make that happen, the Group invited GIS Workshop to participate with the Group and take the draft guidelines that the Committee has developed and seek to incorporate them into an actual database model. GIS Workshop was invited because in its business it does this type of work for numerous Nebraska counties. Chad Kudym and Claire Brown, GIS Workshop, attended the last Group meeting and agreed to do some development work on this concept. The Working Group also began a discussion of what it might contribute to the Strategic Planning process regarding land record information. The next meeting of this group is scheduled for the afternoon of Sep. 22nd at the Papio NRD headquarters.

Street Centerline-Address Database. Larry Zink. This Work Group has also met since the last GIS Council meeting. The current focus of the Group is an exploration of avenues for updating the statewide street centerline-address database that was developed as a part of the NebraskaMAP. That database is now at least 1 – ½ years old and a significant amount of change has occurred, particularly in Sarpy, Douglas and Lancaster Counties. The State Patrol has contracted with GIS Workshop to assist them in updating this data. The initial focus of this effort was to get this updated data into the Patrol's CAD system. The Patrol's CAD system requires some specialized customization of the database. However, because of some outstanding contractual issues with the CAD vendor, the Patrol's current focus is developing an updated centerline dataset to support their Fusion Center GIS. The Fusion Center software will accept a standard geodatabase format. The Patrol will be meeting with GIS Workshop to explore issues related to arranging for this update to support the Fusion Center and hopefully this will also provide a means to update the centerline database of all other users. The next meeting of the Work Group is scheduled for the afternoon of Sep. 21st at the Nebraska State Patrol.

NEBRASKA GEOSPATIAL STRATEGIC PLANNING

Mr. Zink reported that since the last Council meeting, DAS Material received three bid proposals related to the RFP for Geospatial Strategic Planning. The Strategic Planning Committee reviewed those three proposals and [by their independent scoring they recommended](#) that DAS Material pursue a contractual arrangement with Applied Geographics Inc. Mr. Zink informed the Council that a contract has just recently been concluded with Applied Geographics (AppGeo) to assist the Council with its strategic planning effort.

Mr. Zink noted that he has had just one conversation with the AppGeo folks, but they had indicated that they want to get start very soon. They would like to meet with the Council as soon as possible. Mr. Zink

noted that the AppGeo folks indicated that they have an existing conflict with the next scheduled Council meeting on Oct. 5th. Mr. Zink asked about the possibility of rescheduling that meeting to Oct. 4th. After a show of hands, it appeared that Oct. 4th might work. Mr. Zink indicated that he would pursue that matter further with AppGeo folks. [NOTE: Since that meeting, AppGeo was able to arrange things such that they can be at the Oct. 5th Council meeting and so no rescheduling was necessary].

Mr. Zink suggested that the Strategic Planning Committee will play a key role in working with AppGeo to structure and direct the strategic planning process. This will be particularly true because of Mr. Zink's announced decision back in April to resign his current position. Mr. Zink indicated that he had hoped that his replacement would be available by now to be actively involved in shaping the strategic planning process, but no one has yet been hired. Therefore, it is Mr. Zink asked the Council to review [its current Strategic Planning Committee](#) and to add any additional members to insure that adequate representation of the various sectors is available. Mr. Preston suggested that someone from the professional sector should be represented and he offered to serve in that capacity. The Council accepted his offer and he was added to the committee.

GIS COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT UPDATE

Mr. Ohmberger gave a brief update on the effort to hire someone to replace Mr. Zink in his current position of NITC Administrative Manager. Jayne Scofield, IT Administrator for Network Services, is heading up the selection process. Several applications were received for the position as advertised. Three individuals were interviewed and the interview committee felt that they had qualified candidates. Negotiations are current underway with some of the candidates to arrange for a mutually satisfactory agreement that would enable one of the candidates to be hired.

NITC CHARTER REVISION

Mr. Zink noted that at the last GIS Council meeting, the Council adopted some clean up language to its NITC Charter. Among the adopted changes to the Charter was language seeking to clarify members responsibilities relative to potential conflicts of interest. During the discussion on that item, it suggested that Mr. Zink should check with the Accountability and Disclosure Commission to insure that the adopted language was adequate from its perspective. Mr. Zink reported that contact with the Accountability and Disclosure Commission staff resulted in a suggestion for alternative wording for [Section 6.6.2 of the Council Charter](#) and that wording is now proposed to the Council for adoption. Mr. Zink indicated that the proposed wording basically just refers to the existing statutory language related to conflicts of interest and that as a practical matter the statute basically says if you think you have a potential conflict talk with the Accountability and Disclosure folks to determine how best to handle the situation. Mr. Zink noted that any proposed Charter amendments will next go to the NITC for review and potential adoption.

Mr. Chaffin moved to approve the revised [GIS Council Charter](#). Mr. McReynolds second. The motion was [approve unanimously on a roll call vote](#).

UPDATING OF NITC GIS-RELATED ACTION

Mr. Zink noted that one aspect of the GIS Council's relationship with the NITC is the ability to contribute Action Items to the NITC's Statewide Technology Plan. This Plan outlines state's technology action priorities for the upcoming year and is generally updated on approximately a 1 – ½ year cycle. Inclusion of an action item in the Technology Plan does not imply additional resources, but it does imply support for the action initiatives by the NITC. This support can be very helpful if one is seeking support for state agencies, the Legislature, or grants. Mr. Zink noted that several GIS-related action items are in the [current Technology Plan](#) under the more general heading of "State Government Efficiency". The GIS-related action items appear starting on page 63 under the general objective of "Implement Geographic Information System (GIS) as a shared service."

Mr. Zink noted that the [draft action items for the Council for potential adoption](#) are all updates on existing action items. The revised draft language for the most part just provides an update on the current status of

each particular action item. Mr. Zink also noted that a date has not yet been set for the next NITC meeting and so it is likely that the GIS Council will meet again before the NITC meeting and so if it wishes these draft action items could be deferred until the next GIS Council meeting.

Mr. Zink was asked about the LiDAR acquisition action item which notes that it is complete. Mr. Zink indicated that there is a desire to show action items “completed” since the last Technology Plan update. Mr. Zink indicated that he drafted the wording in this way to reflect his understanding that while there was an interest in acquiring additional LiDAR data, it was now on a “as an opportunity presents itself” basis, with no specific plans. Mr. Zink also indicated that while the Working Group had developed some standards guidelines to assist in acquisition efforts, he did not now see the completion of a statewide acquisition plan as being realistic, as was once envisioned.

Mr. Hebert suggested that an action item be added related to land record information. Mr. Zink indicated that he could draft something in this area and send it out to the Council members for review. It was decided to defer action on this item until the October GIS Council meeting.

INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FROM ATTENDEES

The public was invited to make comments. There were no comments offered.

UPDATES FROM MEMBERS AGENCIES

There were no updates reported.

With no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting.

The next GIS Council meeting will be held on October 5th, 1:00 p.m. unless the Council members are informed of a rescheduling due to meeting conflicts with AppGeo.

Vote Tallies date: Sep. 8, 2011

		Roll Call	Motion to Approve 6-29- 2011 Minutes (Chaffin/McReynolds)	Motion to approve the revised GIS Council Charter (Chaffin/McReynolds)
1	Mike Schonlau - Chair - At Large.	P	Y	Y
2	Jeff McReynolds - Vice Chair - Lincoln area .	P	Y	Y
3	Jim Ohmberger (Brenda Decker) - DAS	P	Y	Y
4	Les Howard, Milda Vaitkus (Mark Kuzila) - CSD	P	Y	Y
5	Josh Lear, Kim Menke, (Brian Dunnigan) - DNR	P	Y	Y
6	TBA (Lauren Hill) - PRO	A		
7	Bill Wehling, Rose Braun, (Mike Neidemeyer) - DOR	P	Y	Y
8	Steve Cobb, John Beran - St.Surv	A		
9	Dick Clark (Patrick O'Donnell) -Clk of Leg.	A		
10	Sudhir Ponnapan (Rex Amack) -NGPC	P	Y	Y
11	Ruth Sorensen, Bob Martin - PTA	A		
12	Jim Langtry Federal Agency	P	Y	Y
13	John Miyoshi, Chris Poole - NARD	A/P	Not present	Y
14	Tim Cielocha (Mark Brugger) - Public Power .	P	Y	Y
15	Eric Herbert - NACO rep.	A/P	Not present	Y
16	Lash Chaffin - League	P	Y	Y
17	Karis Bowen, Ge Lin -DHHS	P	Y	Y
18	Chad Boshart (Sue Krogman) - NEMA/Mil.	P	Y	Y
19	Paul Yamamoto, Tom Lamberson (M. Linder)-DEQ	A	.	.
20	Paul Mullen Omaha area	A		
21	Mike Hybl (Sue Vanicek) - PSC	P	Y	Y
22	Mike Preston GIS Prof. Org	P	Y	Y
23	NACO - VACANT		.	
	16 TOTAL PRESENT	16	Yes - 14, No - 0, Ab - 0	Yes - 16, No - 0, Ab - 0

ROLL CALL: "P"=present, "A"=absent

VOTING: "Y"=voting for, "N"=voting against, "A"="Abstained", "NV"=not voting