



*North Carolina*  
Geographic Information Coordinating Council

Minutes  
February 10, 2010

PRESENT

Chair, Dr. Lee Mandell. Members: Bob Brinson, Michael Brown (for Kenneth Lay), John Correllus, Dr. Hugh Devine, John Dorman (for Reuben Young), Dianne Enright (for Melodee Stokes), Jerry Fralick, Derek Graham, Julia Harrell (for Mary Penny Thompson), Colleen Kiley (for Bill Gilmore), Bliss Kite, Kelly Laughton, Sarah Porper, Dan Madding, Herb McKim, Joe McKinney, Tom Morgan (for Elaine Marshall), Doug Newcomb (for Federal Interagency Committee), Anne Payne, Stephen Puckett, Colleen Sharpe, Julie Stamper, Richard Taylor, Rebecca Troutman, and Ron York.

PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council was held in the Board Room of the Department of Public Instruction in Raleigh, North Carolina. Chair Dr. Lee Mandell called the meeting to order. Dr. Mandell reported that from now on the meeting will be recorded to facilitate the preparation of the minutes and asked that everyone speak into the microphones.

The Minutes of the November 10, 2009 meeting were approved.

Status and Discussion of Priorities Before Council

*Priority #1: NC OneMap Implementation*

Tim Johnson reported that several data layers have been updated and are available for free download. They include the Gamelands data layer, the Natural Heritage data layer representing endangered species and an update to the Geology data layer. The Iredell County street centerlines have also been added. Plans for the rest of the fiscal year include migrating the server environment from the servers located here in the Education Building to a virtual server at the Office of Information Technology Services (OITS). This will occur later this month. By the end of March, a map service validation tool will be added that will report when local map services are down and allow CGIA to contact them and determine the reason. The NC OneMap team is looking at methods for caching map services to improve performance of NC OneMap. The target for that is the end of April. The team also plans to make improvements on the data download and data discovery capabilities of NC OneMap. There are no plans to change the viewer until after the TAC submits its recommendations.

*Priority #2: Results of the NC OneMap Feedback Request by the TAC*

Kelly Laughton, chair of the TAC, reminded members that at the last meeting the TAC determined that we needed to clarify our understanding of what NC OneMap is and should be going forward so that the TAC can best accomplish what a technical advisory committee does best and that is advise on the technology needed to fulfill a particular vision. The TAC received terrific feedback from the questions that were circulated to the GICC and the user committees. She referred to the NC OneMap Question Summary in the Council member's packet. The TAC received over 30 responses. That number is not absolute because two groups submitted combined answers so the response reflects the consideration of more than 30 respondents.

The first question is "who or what community should NC OneMap serve?" The general answer is that GIS users and the NC GIS community and the GIS community defined by the vision statement is the primary group that NC OneMap should serve. In addition, a number of stakeholders believe the general public and government in general have a stake in this but for the most part the target of NC OneMap should be the GIS professionals in NC.

The second question asked "What is NC OneMap today? A Viewer; a Data Warehouse; A Clearinghouse; all or something else?" The TAC did not define data warehouse and data clearinghouse and some people might consider these two to be the same. The TAC considers a data clearinghouse to be a place where data is searched for and discovered whereas a data warehouse refers to a central repository where data is collected and retrieved. All the answers back up the TAC's assumption that NC OneMap is primarily a data warehouse, a repository where people can go to get data and have access to statewide data. Less important was that of NC OneMap as a viewer. All of the responses indicated that it was much more important to find and have access to data. Initially, given the state of the technology, it was logical to have a viewer but today with Google Maps and Microsoft Earth, there are so many open source and public domain commercial products that it seems no longer necessary for the State of NC to develop a complex viewer technology. Perhaps the focus should be on making data accessible to the community that uses it.

The final question asked for a vision of the role of NC OneMap in the future and how it should be updated/changed to better serve the needs of the user. There is a whole list but Ms. Laughton believes that the direction of NC OneMap needs to be defined by the M&O Committee. The TAC has two recommendations. First, that the GICC take the information collected and go back to the drawing board and determine NC OneMap's direction going forward and whether the vision and characteristics are still valid. Second, once the GICC has determined the vision, the GIS community needs to help define the user requirements so that the TAC understands exactly what NC OneMap needs to provide. There is a need to dig a little deeper than what the answers to these questions provided so that Council and the TAC understand what the users want and then the TAC can do a better job or recommending the technical solutions. The TAC asks that the Council charge the user committees – LGC, SGUC and FIC – and perhaps the SMAC with helping to define the requirements. This may include an interview of stakeholders to determine the specific needs that users see for NC OneMap to fill. Ms. Laughton noted that she has given some thought to how to accomplish this. At the TAC meeting tomorrow, the TAC will define the questions or interview content of what needs to be gathered and work directly with each user committee chair to help them gather this information.

In summary, the TAC is looking to the M&O for direction on the vision of NC OneMap and direction from the user committees to help us gather the user requirements.

Dr. Mandell asked if the responses indicated any conflict with the current vision of NC OneMap. Ms. Laughton thought that the vision and characteristics are on target but may need to be fine-tuned. The characteristics and vision adopted in 2003 may have been somewhat different than today. The new NC OneMap today may need to be more data focused and less viewer focused which may thereby simplify what we are trying to deliver. He noted that if data access is the number one concern we will provide a great service to our customers.

John Dorman asked for clarification on whether the TAC saw NC OneMap as a data warehouse or data clearinghouse. Ms. Laughton responded that the responses indicated that users overwhelmingly saw a greater need for a data warehouse. That is not to say that all the data would reside on NC OneMap but that it would be the source to go to for data. Dr. Mandell indicated that one of the important benefits is that although the data may come from different sources it can be integrated in a uniform way, which is not something that the data clearinghouse model can deliver. Doug Newcomb asked if NC OneMap would provide web services. Ms. Laughton indicated that the TAC will look at all the options for providing access to the data and web services is a common way to serve data. Providing data for download is key to what most customers hope to achieve. All options including open source and proprietary technology must be considered.

Dr. Mandell summarized that the TAC asked for two things. First, the M&O will reconsider the vision and characteristics of NC OneMap. He noted that the visions and characteristics still seem very valid – a comprehensive statewide geographic resource is about as general as you can get. He agrees that fine-tuning is what is required. The second is for the user committees to come up with specific user requirements. Dr. Mandell charged the committees to come up with the requirements and the staff to develop a comprehensive document that summarizes the results.

Dr. Mandell noted that support of the NC Association of County Commissioners (NCACC) and the NC League of Municipalities (NCLM) is important to encourage the participation of local governments on NC OneMap. One of the current shortcomings is the lack of access to data from local governments that are not currently participating. He indicated that he would talk to the NCACC and NCLM Council reps about how to encourage greater participation by local governments in NC OneMap. Julie Stamper suggested money. Dr. Mandell acknowledged that money continues to be a problem but perhaps there are in-kind resources that can help. Once NC OneMap is refreshed and its functionality improved, it will still not be as valuable as it can be unless all 100 counties contribute data. He asked how many counties are currently participating. Mr. Johnson reported about 60. Dr. Mandell indicated there is room for growth.

Anne Payne suggested that the constituent organizations of the LGC can really help and that it will go a long way if the Council publicizes these efforts through the meetings, newsletters and list serves of the LGC organizations – the Property Mappers Association (PMA), Carolina Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (CURISA), and the North Carolina Local Government Information Systems Association (NCLGISA). Ms. Stamper agreed but also noted that many of the counties still have technical and staff resource barriers. Mr. Newcomb suggested

that the GICC could help by providing two or three methodologies with step-by-step instructions that counties could use to serve their data.

John Correllus liked the suggestions and noted that the SGUC agrees with the goal of defining detailed requirements. He suggested that a common facilitator do the requirements gathering to avoid getting very different perspectives. That might require money but there are resources that may be available to expedite the process.

Rebecca Troutman asked what sort of outreach has been conducted to the counties that are not participating and, if it is a matter of technical assistance, can that be made available to encourage counties to come on board. Mr. Johnson reported that several years ago CGIA made a big push to bring counties on board, with some success, but that the time is right to reach out again. He agreed with Ms. Stamper that not all counties are technically ready. Tom Morgan reported that the Property Mappers Association and the Secretary of State's Office have already scheduled six workshops around the state this spring and that CGIA has agreed to participate on the agenda to promote NC OneMap. This will be a vehicle to start that outreach.

Dr. Mandell agreed with Ms. Payne that we need to conduct more outreach but that may not bring in many more participants and asked what else can be provided in terms of technical assistance. In response to Mr. Correllus' suggestion, he wondered if it might be better for the user committees to first consider the requirements individually.

Mr. Correllus noted that the committees should at least have a collective set of documents to fill out. Ms. Laughton agreed and noted that the objective of tomorrow's TAC meeting is to develop a common questionnaire and that it may make sense for a TAC member to participate in the process. Mr. Correllus acknowledged the resource constraints and suggested that perhaps OITS may have project managers with experience in requirements analysis that could help.

Mr. Dorman noted that NC OneMap has been around for a long time now and that the 60 counties have the resources to participate. The question is what is preventing the 40 counties from participating. Mr. Morgan noted that counties are waiting for the Working Group for Seamless Parcels to develop and deliver a translation tool which may facilitate sharing parcel data. Some counties may be more willing to participate in NC OneMap once that tool is functional. Dr. Mandell suggested that the Council may be able to leverage programs that have been funded and require 100% participation to engage these counties.

Ms. Laughton noted an item that recently came out of the LGC is the multiple requests from the Census Bureau to individual counties and municipalities for local data – street centerlines, jurisdictional boundaries, addresses – to support the census. Can the Council invite a Census Bureau representation to a Council meeting and demonstrate how NC OneMap could serve as a one stop resource for the Census Bureau to acquire data from all 100 counties? If so, there could be the possibility of funding support from the Census Bureau and it will also reduce the burden on counties in dealing with these repeated requests. Counties may begin to see the benefits of participating in NC OneMap. She noted that we may be able to demonstrate the value of NC OneMap, not just to the technical staff but to the commissioners and elected officials.

Ms. Payne noted that the SMAC has two subcommittees – WGRT and WGSP – that are working on data sharing and statewide seamless data sets and that they should be involved in the

requirements analysis. Ms. Laughton agreed that the activities of those committees dovetail beautifully with the TAC's efforts.

In regard to providing technical assistance, Julia Harrell noted that in the first round of outreach to counties on NC OneMap, staff conducted workshops and it proved very useful for local government staff to have hands-on opportunities to establish WMS connections rather than send them a cookbook. Technology has gotten easier to manage in the last six years and since there has probably been significant staff turnover at the local level another series of workshops would be good at this time.

Ms. Stamper applauded the PMA workshop idea because they are free and close enough for counties to attend.

Stephen Puckett asked about the issue of some counties generating income from selling data. Mr. Morgan acknowledges that this is the biggest problem that the WGRT and WGSP have to deal with. His solution is to love them into working with us.

**ACTION #1:** The M&O Committee will reassess the vision and characteristics of NC OneMap.

**ACTION #2:** The LGC, FIC, and SGUC, with support from the TAC and staff, will define user requirements for NC OneMap. The TAC will prepare materials to support this task. Staff will prepare a summary report of the results.

*Priority #3: ESRI Enterprise License Agreement (ELA)*

Jerry Fralick noted that one of the Governor's directives was to look at IT expenditures. He reached out to the vendor community and asked them to help given that state revenues are down. One approach is to work with vendors to explore cost savings and cost avoidances and to ask them to come up with different models of doing business, especially leveraging more services within agreements. The ESRI ELA is up for renewal. OITS presented a case to ESRI for a plan that would support state and local governments and the community college system. ESRI provided a proposal this week that incorporated a lot of our requests and would represent savings to the state of around \$10M. There is no agreement yet. A meeting is scheduled for Friday and he is hopeful that an ELA for the state and a master purchasing agreement for local governments can be in place soon.

Mr. Correllus noted that the SGUC had been very involved in negotiating the previous agreement but had limited involvement the last six weeks. Mr. Johnson said that the last six weeks has been focused on the local government portion of the agreement. Mr. Fralick said he can share with the SGUC what ESRI proposed. ESRI has offered a price break based for communities with a population of 100,000 or less with the opportunity to negotiate a price for larger communities on a case by case basis. Dr. Mandell said that this represents a step forward as local governments were not included previously. The proposal includes price breaks on training and other products and it looks good. There is a phone call this Friday at 11:30 and Mr. Fralick invited Mr. Correllus and others to participate. Mr. Correllus pointed out that technically the local governments were included in the last ELA. Mr. Fralick noted that one of his goals was to make the product available to local governments at a lower price.

Dr. Mandell asked about the status of CGIA rates. Mr. Fralick said that OITS is examining the rate structure and expects to release a lower rate structure, subject to the approval of the Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM), within a couple of weeks.

Regarding the ELA, Mr. Correllus reported that state agencies had a lot of apprehension about the ESRI software costs. Departments are developing budgets for next year right now and need to know the cost implications. He indicated that Mr. Bakolia had previously indicated that the IT fund might pick up \$300,000 of the costs and asked if there was more information about how the costs would be paid. The longer this goes, the more difficult it will be for departments to plan. Sarah Porper reported that a couple of other ELAs are being negotiated that affect departments and that OSBM understands the challenges that departments face in their budget planning. Mr. Correllus asked if the numbers would be available before the next GICC meeting, at which time the General Assembly would be in session and budget recommendations need to be in place. Mr. Fralick said that is why he is accelerating the negotiations with ESRI.

#### 2010 Statewide Orthophotography Project, NC 911 Board

(see PPT at GICC website - <http://ncgicc.net/Meetings/tabid/138/Default.aspx>)

Mr. Johnson reported that all the agreements are now in place between the City of Durham, CGIA, the Geospatial and Technology Management Office in the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety and the 911 Board. The project team is meeting on a weekly basis to assess progress and address issues that arise. The goal is to fly the state using the orthophotography standard developed by the Land Records Management Program and adopted by the Council and to deliver the data by the spring of 2011. Mr. Johnson directed the Council's attention to the handout, which summarizes the status of the project.

NC Geodetic Survey has established a calibration site in Surry County to validate the cameras. All the cameras used in this project will have an accuracy validation based on the calibration from that site. Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS) to support GPS are being installed at a number of sites across the state. Ground control target points that aid positional accuracy, image processing, and quality control are being installed. The process is mostly complete. Vertical flight lines shown in yellow are those areas where data have been collected. ESP and Associates along with Aero-Metric and Surdex are responsible for flights in eastern NC, where 36% of the images have been collected. No collection has occurred on military lands. John Dorman and his staff are working with the military officials to get approval to fly over the bases. Installation of ground control points in the west is underway. AMEC along with Sanborn and Photoscience are responsible for flights in western NC. Weather has impacted some of the flights but acquisition in the west can occur later because the trees leaf-out later. Imagery acquisition will continue throughout the winter. Concurrent with the data collection is the definition of information technology requirements, which will be followed by design and implementation. CGIA is leading that effort which will lead to improvements in the functionality of NC OneMap. The effort is being coordinated through the Enterprise Project Management Office in OITS. The project team reports monthly to the NC 911 Board. The first report is next Friday.

Ms. Troutman asked if the team is coordinating with local governments. Mr. Johnson reported that the web site describes the project and includes the frequently asked questions. He expects to add a status map soon that will be updated regularly. Ms. Stamper noted that a local government representative is now participating on the Working Group for Orthophotography Planning. Ms.

Troutman asked if data sharing agreements are in place. Richard Taylor said that all 100 counties will receive the data. Ms. Troutman asked if the project team is talking to the right people in the counties, such as the tax administrators. Mr. Johnson said that a letter had been sent to all county managers but that the project team will do more to inform local governments. Dr. Mandell asked if the ground points and CORS could be used again for future projects so that the state can leverage the current investments. Gary Thompson responded yes.

#### Presentation: Is Your Town Missing Out On \$450,000?

(see PPT at GICC website - <http://ncgicc.net/Meetings/tabid/138/Default.aspx>)

Jeff Triezenberg, GIS Manager for the Town of Knightdale, described a GIS application that resulted in significant financial benefits for the town. Franchise taxes for various utilities including electric, cable, telephone and natural gas are paid directly to the State of NC for each account. The State then reimburses counties and municipalities for each account that falls within a particular jurisdiction. A private contractor made a proposal to the town's Finance Director to conduct an analysis to determine if the town was being reimbursed for all of the accounts that were located within the municipal boundary of Knightdale. The proposed contractor fee was 50% of the fees that were recovered. The Finance Director suspected that the address data of the electric utility was in error and approached Mr. Triezenberg to see if the Planning/GIS Department could conduct the analysis in-house.

Mr. Triezenberg reported that this was a straightforward GIS application and began the analysis. The current population estimate projected 3,480 households, not including commercial, office and industrial users but the electric company's file only listed 2,885 accounts. Mr. Triezenberg acquired the address data from the electric utility, overlaid it on the city's boundary and discovered almost 2,800 incorrectly coded accounts, including the town's largest industrial tenant and an entire apartment complex. The town started with 2,886 accounts. The GIS analysis determined that 75 accounts were incorrectly coded as being within the Town of Knightdale but that 2,773 accounts were incorrectly coded as being outside the town. The final tally was 5,584 accounts, significantly more than the 2,885 that the electric utility listed.

The State only reimburses jurisdictions for errors over the previous three years. Still, the town of Knightdale received a lump sum payment of approximately \$450,000 in compensation for lost revenue over the last three years. In addition, the quarterly electric franchise reimbursements from the state increased from \$25,000 to \$50,000. The challenge is keeping the data current but there is obviously great incentive to do so. The use of GIS resulted in an unexpected windfall for the Town of Knightdale.

#### Final Report on the US National Grid Project

(see PPT at GICC website - <http://ncgicc.net/Meetings/tabid/138/Default.aspx>)

Jeff Brown, Project Manager for CGIA, provided an update on the US National Grid project. In a disaster, street signs and other navigational tools that we take for granted may be gone. Emergency responders, especially those from out of the area, need simple, reliable ways to navigate to save time, money and lives. The US National Grid (USNG) is a spatially-based, operational framework to report locations for evacuation, search and rescue and recoveries. The USNG is linked to the Military Grid Reference System and uses a grid system to assign a unique and easily referenced number to locations.

The GICC adopted the USNG in 2007 and that decision is a wonderful example of how coordination works in NC. Harry Lee, GIS Coordinator for Camden County, raised the issue with Ms. Stamper, chair of the LGC, who subsequently asked the GICC to investigate. A subcommittee under the SMAC assessed the value of the USNG to NC and recommended that it be adopted. The GICC tasked staff with exploring how to promote the use of the USNG. CGIA submitted a grant proposal to FGDC to conduct outreach to educate the GIS community and the emergency management community in North Carolina on the use of the U.S. National Grid.

The grant was funded and the project team developed customized training and outreach materials for North Carolina users. The materials are accessible through the NC OneMap web site. The team also conducted four hands-on workshops and a two-day “train-the-trainer” workshop; gave two conference presentations; and conducted a Webinar on the National States Geographic Information Council. The in-state workshops included local and state emergency managers as well as GIS professionals. The NC OneMap viewer was updated to include USNG coordinates.

### Committee Reports

All Council committee representatives reported on their group’s activities.

***Local Government Committee (LGC).*** Ms. Stamper said the LGC has prepared a draft work plan to guide the committee’s activities and to hopefully improve the committee’s accountability and effectiveness. The LGC will probably wait until the new CGIA Coordination Program Manager is hired before finalizing the plan.

Ms. Stamper expressed LGC concerns about the Ramona GIS inventory tool. She understands that it was built to serve the nation but feels that the tool is not working for North Carolina. She noted that certain questions are repeatedly posted to the various list serves. The questions may relate to the location of the GIS unit within a local government; the name of the GIS contact; or the fees that governments charge for paper maps. Tom Morgan agreed that it is difficult to extract that kind of information from Ramona. Dr. Mandell acknowledged that it is also difficult to get people to enter and update their information in any survey. Ms. Stamper said that it is difficult to convey the benefits of participating. Mr. Johnson said that we will need requirements if we want to consider changes. Dr. Mandell suggested that we dust off the Incentives report that the LGC prepared several years ago. [In 2008, the LGC submitted a report to the GICC entitled “Incentives for Adhering to Standards”. It cited three incentives that would encourage local governments to adhere to standards: 1) workshops and educational opportunities; 2) a hotline to CGIA for accessing technical assistance; and 3) monetary incentives in the form of grants or cost share programs.] Mr. Johnson said that staff would assess the utility of Ramona as a solution for the GIS community to submit information on their data holdings.

Ms. Stamper supported Ms. Laughton’s suggestion that we approach the Census Bureau about better ways for them to acquire data from NC for the 2020 census. Mr. Morgan agreed and suggested that we not wait eight years but initiate the discussion early in the decade.

***GIS Technical Advisory Committee (GIS TAC).*** Ms. Laughton had nothing further to add to the earlier discussion.



***Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC).*** Ms. Anne Payne reported that the Committee met on January 13. She invited subcommittee chairs to report on the activities of the various subcommittees.

Working Group for Orthophotography Planning. Gary Thompson said the group's primary focus over the last three months has been on the statewide ortho project. The working group will meet again on March 8 and resume work on two tasks that have been on hold: the issue paper on color infrared photography and the business plan for statewide imagery acquisition. Ms. Payne reminded the Council that the 911 Board's funding of statewide imagery acquisition in 2010 was a windfall and that there is no guarantee that the 911 Board will be able to provide funding in the future. The GIS community needs a sustainable funding resource and it is important to prepare the business plan.

She noted that the working group is working on a naming convention for orthophotography files. A representative of State Archives is participating. Mr. Morgan noted that is important to have a naming convention for any data that is managed using the NC 10K State Plane Coordinate grid system, similar to the system used for generating Cadastral PIN numbers. Ms. Payne said this convention is based on the file naming system used by the Floodplain Mapping Program and includes information within the file name such as pixel size and creation date as well as the State Plane Coordinate information. Dr. Mandell applauded the inclusion of State Archives.

Working Group for Roads and Transportation. Alex Rickard, co-chair of the working group, reported that WGRT submitted a proposal through the FGDC 2010 Cooperative Agreements Program for funds to support the group's plans. The proposal included 19 letters of support and Mr. Rickard thanked the Council and the various committees that provided letters. He also acknowledged the critical contribution by Ms. Harrell in preparing the proposal, which he plans to post to the web site.

He reported that for the first time the WGRT has a long term vision on paper. The first phase is a new revision of NC StreetMap. Phase two is the revision of the existing roads data standard. Phase three is the creation of a translation tool that can ingest local road centerline data and translate into a state format for a seamless statewide street centerline database. Phase four will be to convince all 100 counties to participate with DOT in the development of the statewide database.

In an effort to make the NC standard consistent with the FGDC standard, the group added 15 items to the standard. These will be automatically added by the translator tool. The WGRT will propose this at the next SMAC meeting.

Mr. Rickard said that it is uncertain whether the WGRT or the Working Group for Seamless Parcels (WGSP) will be the first to develop a translator tool but the hope is that a tool can support the efforts of both working groups. A small subcommittee will work on the design requirements. Members will include Janet Lowe from DOT and co-chair of the WGRT, Tom Morgan and Pam Carver, co-chairs of the WGSP and Kelly Laughton.

Stream Mapping Advisory Committee. Joe Sewash, CGIA, reported on four issues related to the work of the Stream Mapping Advisory Committee.

The first is feature name designations. There are multiple sources of names. The Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) is the federal standard for geographic names and the committee decided to focus on the GNIS as prescribed by the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) standard. The committee has drafted a white paper that will recommend stakeholders maintaining alternate stream names distribute these names as an indexed layer to the NHD. The committee will work with the NC BGN in the final development of this recommendation.

The committee is evaluating the FGDC wetlands mapping standard and how it relates to the NC Wetlands Assessment Method (NC WAM), developed by NC stakeholders for use in regulatory business processes. Currently NC WAM does not have a geospatial standard for data content and structure. The committee will draft a geospatial standard for spatial representation of NC WAM.

USGS is updating the traditional topographic products in digital form – called US Topo. NHD is the hydrography source for US Topo. North Carolina is committed to developing local resolution NHD and has completed that work for 19 counties in western NC and is working to integrate the local resolution data into the NHD. The committee will explore differences between the NHD dataset that includes local resolution and the hydrography representation of US Topo.

The final issue is the integration of the watershed boundary dataset with the National Hydrography Dataset. There is one standard of maintenance practices within the hydrography community for the maintenance of surface water features and a completely independent process for the maintenance of watershed boundaries. These collide in respect to regulatory business processes. There are numerous features where a stream bisects a watershed, which violates the principle of a watershed or drainage area. The parties that are responsible for these two disparate datasets are trying to integrate the two datasets. The Stream Mapping Advisory Committee is participating in these activities and staying abreast of these efforts so that it can take advantage of the results.

Ms. Payne reported on the activities of two other SMAC subcommittees. The WGSP has submitted a scope of work to EPA for the grant that was funded and is waiting on EPA to select a contractor and approve the scope of work before work can begin. The NC Board on Geographic Names has received a number of requests for name changes and plans a face-to-face meeting to deal with them.

***State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC).*** Mr. John Correllus said that the SGUC will meet next on March 16. The meetings will be moved to the Childhood Development Center to take advantage of that facility's technology. SGUC members outside of the Raleigh area are often unable to attend due to travel costs or travel restrictions. The SGUC will be able to use web conferencing technology so that state government GIS users outside of Raleigh can participate or view the presentations. In addition, members outside of Raleigh can share their presentations. Typically 50-70 people attend and this change should increase the attendance and participation.

There have been two Executive Committee (EC) meetings. The EC meeting in December was entirely devoted to preparing a group response to the TAC's questions on NC OneMap. The EC also met in January and decided that the EC would begin to meet every other month instead of monthly. If issues come up in the interim that need to be addressed, then the EC will schedule special meetings or address the issues through email. At the January meeting, the SGUC members expressed their thanks to Diana Hales for her support to the SGUC over the years and

wished her well in retirement. The rest of the meeting was devoted to agency reports on their activities and plans over the next year and what they might need from other agencies. The opportunity to network and to learn from what other agencies are doing is very valuable. The minutes of that meeting will be posted soon and will have more detail about those reports. Dr. Mandell observed that this model is valuable outside the GIS community as well. The Council should always look for opportunities to leverage on the efforts of others and noted that the OSBM is always interested in as much leveraging and cooperation as possible.

***Federal Interagency Committee (FIC).*** Doug Newcomb reported that the EC met on January 20. The main topic of discussion was the buy-up options for processing the CIR band that will be collected during the statewide ortho project. That project does not include funds to process the CIR band. FIC EC members would like to have cost estimates for processing the CIR band although none of the agencies is currently able to provide funds for that purpose. The next meeting of the FIC is in April.

Regarding the earlier discussion on seamless roads, Mr. Newcomb recommended that the WGRT explore the use of Open Street Map. This product is developed by volunteers and was used in the aftermath of the earthquake in Haiti. Mr. Rickard said that Open Street Map had come up in discussions of the WGRT and that the committee would look at it again.

Mr. Newcomb inquired about the status of the appointment of the FIC chair. Mr. Johnson responded that two candidates will be submitted to the Governor's Office for consideration.

***Management and Operations Committee (M&O).*** Dr. Mandell said the M&O Committee will meet March 5 to address the task assigned by the TAC today and will also look at the Master Address Dataset and continuity issues related to that product. The M&O Committee will also look at questions related to surveyor's law. Legal counsel from OITS has reviewed the questions raised in the NCBELS letter to the Attorney General's Office and the questions that the LGC raised in the letter that the GICC sent to the Attorney General's Office. Access to this kind of legal expertise is one of the most tangible benefits of the move by CGIA to OITS and the Council is very appreciative of that support.

#### Council Member Announcements and News

Mr. Morgan reported that the Secretary of State has been supporting the adoption of "electronic" initiatives to include e-signature, e-commerce and e-record. Today the Secretary of State's office, for the first time ever in the Nation, recorded a survey plat electronically in Johnston County. Dr. Mandell acknowledged that this is another example of the synergy regarding issues of interest to the GICC.

Ms. Payne announced that the FGDC addressing standard is going out for final review next week. It is very thorough and is a standard that the GICC will likely be asked to review in the future. Ms. Payne offered to make it available for anyone who wants to review it.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be May 12, 2010 from 1:00-3:00 pm at the Department of Public Instruction Board Room, Room 755,

301 N. Wilmington Street, Raleigh.

PowerPoint presentations and reports are on the Council Web site: [www.ncgicc.org](http://www.ncgicc.org) Click on “Meetings.” Presentations and documents presented during the meeting are available in a Zip file for easy download.