North Carolina
Geographic Information Coordinating Council

NCGICC

Minutes
May 12, 2010

PRESENT

Chair, Dr. Lee Mandell. Members: Bob Brinson, Michael Brown (for Kenneth Lay), Rodney Bunch, John Correllus, John Cox, John Dorman (for Reuben Young), Ryan Draughn, Jeff Essic (for Hugh Devine), John Farley, Jerry Fralick, John Gillis, Bill Gilmore, Derek Graham, Julia Harrell (for Mary Penny Thompson), Bliss Kite, Kelly Laughton, Dan Madding, Herb McKim, Joe McKinney, Tom Morgan (for Elaine Marshall), Anne Payne, Drew Pilant (for Federal Interagency Committee), Sarah Porper, Jeremy Poss, Colleen Sharpe, Julie Stamper, Melodee Stokes, Richard Taylor, Saundra Williams 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 noted that the meeting will be recorded to facilitate the preparation of the minutes and asked that everyone speak into the microphones.

The minutes of the February 10, 2010 meeting were approved.

Status and Discussion of Priorities Before the Council

Priority #1: GICC Annual Report

Dr. Mandell discussed the importance of the annual report. It is a record of what the Council did in the past and lays out a roadmap of the Council's future plans. It is important to inform non-Council members about the Council's activities. He reported that during the past two weeks he met with the Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM), Senator Basnight's office, Speaker Hackney's office, the Governor's Office, Fiscal Research in the General Assembly and Representative Tolson and presented the annual report. He used that opportunity to talk about the Council's current initiatives and the challenges of the coming year and to prepare them for the possibility of requests for funding to complete the tasks that the General Assembly has assigned to this Council. Perhaps the most important part of this effort was to raise the awareness of these people about GIS and the role of the Council. Dr. Mandell reported that the he received a positive response from everyone with whom he met. Outreach to the Governor and the legislature is an important piece that the Council needs to concentrate on in the future. He emphasized that the

GIS community has allies beyond just the members of the Council and the Council must engage these folks. He reminded the members that Representative Tolson is the one who sponsored the legislation that was adopted last year and is a big supporter. Dr. Mandell may call on one or more of the Council members to accompany him to future meetings to make sure that the people who are making the important decisions know what is going on with statewide GIS and what the needs are, and also to remind them periodically that the General Assembly assigned us a number of tasks but neglected to provide funds to accomplish those tasks and that we will be coming back for that.

Priority #2: NC OneMap Vision and Characteristics

Dr. Mandell reminded the members that when the Council first started NC OneMap, it began with the premise that we needed a big vision of where we wanted to go and the Council spent a lot of time developing a vision statement and a list of characteristics of what NC OneMap should look like and how it should it work. This document has guided the efforts over the last six years. One of the assignments that the General Assembly gave the Council is to refresh NC OneMap. The Management & Operations Committee (M&O) revisited the vision and characteristics, reviewed it and got input from the various committees. The M&O came up with very few changes. Dr. Mandell noted that he was pleased with the need for only minimal changes, an indication that the Council did a very good job in developing the original vision. It provides a sound foundation for the future work required to refresh NC OneMap. Lofty goals remain but many are achievable and it is important when talking to the legislature to inform them on the Council's direction and progress. He asked for comments about the revised document.

The Council approved the revised Vision and Characteristics.

Dr. Mandell noted that an accompaniment to the document is a list of 37 data themes that form the foundation of NC OneMap. Seven are framework layers and the others are layers that the Council members originally considered critical. The M&O has recognized the need to revisit this list because it is important in terms of acquiring new data and prioritizing the maintenance of the data. In the coming weeks the committees will be asked to review the list of data layers and to ensure it is up-to-date. Please take this task seriously.

   ACTION #1   Committees will review the list of 37 NC OneMap data themes - assessing which themes should be on the list; recommending themes that need to be added; and providing a priority rating for each theme.

Priority #3: NC OneMap Implementation

Tim Johnson reported that staff have been working on the infrastructure behind NC OneMap related to the map services that are provided through the partners. One task involves a tool that recognizes when map services are down so that partners can be notified that the service needs to be checked. This task is on schedule.

Staff is in the process of migrating NC OneMap servers from the Education Building to the Eastern Data Center at OITS. About 20% of the process remains to be completed. Once that is done, staff will address improved data discovery capability of NC OneMap, improved data download capabilities and other tasks. Recent data releases include significant natural heritage

areas and natural heritage element occurrences, both provided regularly by DENR; and three datasets through cooperative work between the Council and the Homeland Security Infrastructure Program – public health department locations; the location of correctional facilities, federal, state and local including detention facilities; and law enforcement locations.

Mr. Johnson announced that the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) awarded a grant to CGIA to apply a formal return-on-investment (ROI) methodology to an Interagency Leadership Team project. The ROI methodology will be used to assess the value of GIS data available through NC OneMap. Mr. Johnson and Joe Sewash from CGIA will work with a number of other ILT agencies on this effort. The grant was awarded in the last 20 days and is on a fast track. Project members participated in an FGDC workshop along with other FGDC grant awardees – the State of Iowa and the Metro GIS representing the Minneapolis/ St. Paul area. Sarah Porper with the State Budget Office and folks from the State CIO's office also represented the NC team in the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to learn the methodology. This is a step forward, not only for NC OneMap but for other IT projects, to be able to demonstrate the return on investment for data development and maintenance efforts that the state has not always been able to document.

Dr. Mandell noted that he described this project when he met with representatives of the legislature and the Governor's office and they are very excited about this project. Every major project that goes through the State CIO's office for approval has to produce a cost/benefit analysis. It would be an understatement to say that they are not all of equal quality. So having support from outside to improve the ROI methodology, not simply for a case study on GIS but one that is transferrable to the broader IT community, can pay off handsomely for the State. He anticipates great things out of this project so that the Council can improve what it takes back to the General Assembly and the decision makers.

Ms. Kelly Eubank, with State Archives in the Department of Cultural Resources, gave an update on the archival efforts. She is the co-principal investigator with CGIA on the Library of Congress data preservation project. The team has completed a number of outreach activities including a presentation to the State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC). The team will also be presenting at the ESRI International Users Conference in San Diego, where there will be a special workshop on data preservation. The project has new funding from the Library of Congress that will fund the project through June 2011. The team has completed two sets of data transfers to State Archives, involving data that has been superseded on NC OneMap and replaced with updated data. To date, 741 gigabytes and 48,141 datasets have been transferred. Since Dr. Mandell had asked about access, Ms. Eubank noted that State Archives has put the data in two catalogues so that it is discoverable by the public. Users can find the data in an on-line finding aid, the MARS catalogue in the State archive. In addition, 20 datasets are now available in a library focus tool called ContentDM. The data have been converted to pdf files for users without GIS software to download the data. She noted that there has been a good response to this catalogue. The data were put up two weeks ago and there have been 1,293 page views to date, of which 736 were unique visitors to the site. The project is successfully testing the barriers to geospatial data preservation.

Priority #4: Surveyor's Model Law Working Group

Herb McKim reported that the Surveyor's Model Law Working Group has been working with the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCBELS) to address the question of what constitutes surveying and what constitutes GIS and what activities require a licensed surveyor when collecting data. The groups had reached agreement on several issues but a couple of other issues were unresolved. Both the GICC and NCBELS submitted letters to the Attorney General's Office seeking advisory opinions on a couple of questions. The letter from the GICC focused on whether local governments could collect data for another jurisdiction without the oversight of a licensed surveyor. The letter with the response from the Attorney General's Office is in the packet. The opinion of the Attorney General's Office is that state agencies and local government jurisdictions are all one unit and therefore are exempt from the law that requires a local surveyor to collect GIS data as long as the jurisdiction is doing the data collection as part of their official business. So any local government can collect data for another local government because they are all considered one unit.

Julie Stamper asked about whether the ruling applies to temporary employees or interns. Mr. McKim responded that as long as the person is an employee of the jurisdiction, they are covered by this ruling. He did not feel qualified to answer the question of whether an intern is an employee.

Dan Madding asked if the ruling addressed Councils of Government (COGs). Mr. McKim responded that the question about COGs was not included in the letter from the GICC. NCBELS asked that question in their letter. NCBELS has received a response and are meeting right now and will report on that ruling to the GICC after their meeting.

Ryan Draughn asked if there has been any effort to inform local governments about the ruling. Mr. McKim answered no but that would be the next step. The ruling was just issued and the Working Group wanted to report to the GICC before publicizing the ruling. Dr. Mandell noted that it seemed a bit premature to make any announcements without knowing the answer about the COG situation and without first getting the reaction from Council members to the ruling. He noted that it would not be appropriate to take any action until the NCBELS Board met. Once NCBELS reports on the ruling related to COGs, then the next step will be to get information out to the local government community about what they are able to do and under what conditions.

Bill Gilmore noted that the Ecosystem Enhancement Program has been working with the Licensing Board for boundary surveys to determine what rules apply regarding activities involving DOT and DENR. Mr. Gilmore's understanding is that state government GIS staff can collect data but once a boundary needs to be surveyed, a licensed surveyor must be involved.

Dr. Mandell noted that the ruling is good news and that the Council received the answer that it wanted. He thanked Jerry Fralick, the State CIO, for engaging his staff attorney, who reviewed and made improvements to the draft letter so that it addressed the Council's issues in the appropriate legal way.

ACTION #2   The Surveyor's Model Law Working Group will meet and discuss the response to the GICC letter, will await a report from the NCBELS Board and then work with staff to disseminate the rulings to the GIS community.

Priority #5: ESRI GIS Software Enterprise License Agreement

Mr. Fralick reminded the members that the State and ESRI have been in discussions about renewing the enterprise license agreement (ELA) for ESRI's GIS software.   The proposed agreement includes items for both state and local government GIS users and he believes that it represents a great value to the State. For local governments, there is a master purchase agreement and forgiveness of back maintenance for those that have not been able to keep current with their software maintenance. For Executive Branch agencies, OITS staff have compiled an accurate inventory of software licenses and, working with the SGUC, the number of licenses have been confirmed with each state agency over the last two weeks. During year one of the agreement, the IT fund will pay $300,000 of the $600,000 cost of the agreement. Based on the inventory of licenses, state departments will be allocated the cost of the remaining $300,000. In year two of the agreement, FY 2011-12, the IT fund will not be able to cover any of the costs. This may be an issue that the Council will want to take up with OSBM or the General Assembly. The inventory will be reviewed on an annual basis prior to establishing each agency's cost for the year. Over the next two weeks, OITS Chief Financial Officer John McShane will send a MOU to each agency conveying the agency's portion of the cost for FY 2010-11.

A final agreement with ESRI should be signed soon and will result in a continuation of the ELA for the next 5 years. Mr. Fralick expressed his appreciation to all who participated in the discussions and negotiations.

John Correllus said that this is a great value to the state but it impacts the budget of individual agencies and it is difficult to plan for. Agencies will be liable for $300,000 next year and then the full $630,000 in FY 2011-12 with 5% increases thereafter. Is there any chance that the GICC and the agencies could support a join expansion budget request for these costs?   In the overall scheme of other enterprise licenses that agencies use, this cost is relatively minor. But there is a real time and cost factor in calculating the number of licenses that each agency needs and preparing budget requests. The General Assembly may be faced with 16 separate agency expansion budget requests.

Sarah Porper responded that if each agency submits a request, then each agency would simultaneously need to acknowledge its expansion budget request for this item as a priority. Mr. Correllus suggested that if the request came from OITS, with the support of all of the agencies, then the priority would be on the OITS list. Mr. Fralick suggested that it is worth a discussion in the future. The issue is settled for the coming fiscal year but the one after that is the one in question. He meets regularly with the Senate appropriations chairs and if he can have a list of the agency needs and can get it in at the appropriate time, it may be easier for the General Assembly to include it in the OITS budget.

Mr. Correllus noted that this item has not been in the agency budgets for some time and the licenses are an important tool for state services. All of the agencies around the table utilize and rely on GIS. If every agency reduces the number of licenses to reduce costs, the outcome will probably be that agencies reduce their request for licenses proportionately and the actual cost to the agency remains the same. The impact is that the state agencies may reduce services, out of a fear factor, without reducing overall costs.

Dr. Mandell acknowledged the problem. He noted that in the past there have been two models – either the costs were in the individual agency budget or the costs were covered by the IT fund. One solution may a hybrid model that will require discussion in terms of what works practically in terms of getting it through OSBM and then through the legislature.

Dr. Mandell also noted that as an organization such as the GICC matures, processes become more formal, which can be good and bad. The administration of the ESRI contact was managed very informally, essentially by Dianne Enright, the former SGUC chair. In terms of managing the new ELA, it may be important to not only look at a central point of funding but a central point for managing the ELA. The ELA is a big deal and deserves that level of attention. Mr. Correllus said that he understands that OITS actually plans to hire someone in the procurement section to manage the ESRI ELA.   Mr. Fralick confirmed that plan.

Ms. Stamper asked if there is a plan to inform local governments about the new agreement and how the new ELA will affect them.   She said that she is getting lots of questions and that local governments are working on budgets. Mr. Johnson suggested that we wait until the agreement is actually signed. At that point, the staff can conduct outreach through the League of Municipalities, the Association of County Commissioners and the Local Government Committee to inform local governments. Mr. Fralick said that we can post the information to the web sites.

Mr. Correllus reported that a big component of ELA is that all K-12 institutions will be able to access licenses free of charge. This could be a massive roll out. Derek Graham asked if this was different than the agreement that the university community has with ESRI. Mr. Correllus said yes, that K-12 would receive the licenses and updates free of charge. How the state manages this needs to be determined.

> ACTION #3   Once the ELA is signed, staff will work with League of Municipalities, the Association of County Commissioners, the Local Government Committee and other committees to inform the GIS community.

2010 Statewide Orthophotography Project, NC 911 Board
(see PPT at GICC website - http://ncgicc.net/Meetings/tabid/138/Default.aspx)

Mr. Johnson updated the members on the status of the Statewide Orthophotography Project. This project was funded by the NC 911 Board at a level of $12.3M in response to a grant submitted by the City of Durham to acquire orthoimagery for all 100 counties. CGIA is serving as the project manager. The project team includes Crime Control & Public Safety's Geospatial and Technology Management Office, led by John Dorman, NC Geodetic Survey, led by Gary Thompson, the Secretary of State's Office, led by Tom Morgan, and the City of Durham, led by Tonya Pearce.

The flights occurred during the period January through April. The imagery meets the Council adopted standard that originated in the Secretary of State's Office. The data will be delivered to all 100 counties around this time next year on hard drive and the imagery will also be available for download from NC OneMap. There are 9 components to the project. The first four - Flight Planning, Improvements to Base Stations, Ground Control, and Aerial Acquisition - have been completed.

Component number five is underway and the final four steps will be completed later this year. One of the important accomplishments is that the Continuously Operating Reference Station

(CORS) network has been beefed up statewide   Led by NC Geodetic Survey, 41 CORS sites have been upgraded, which will not only support this project but future projects. It is an investment by the NC 911 Board that will benefit the GIS community in the future.

Another important component is to establish a control network and that has been completed statewide. The density of the network in the west is due to the sudden elevation changes in western NC.

As of May 2, imagery has been acquired for the entire state with the exception of a small area in Perquimans County – a military facility called Harvey Point. The military flew its own imagery and will provide data to the project team. This has truly been a monumental effort on behalf of the Geospatial and Technology Management Office and the contractors working under them. There were as many as 12 planes in the air to collect the imagery.

The next step is aerial triangulation to enable geographic referencing of the imagery. This is accomplished in blocks. The PowerPoint shows the status of this task. The next steps are processing of the imagery and a series of quality control checks before the data is transferred to CGIA for final verification and distribution.

Concurrent with these activities is work on the IT side to ensure that the infrastructure at NC OneMap is sufficient to handle the volume of data. For additional information, check the project site at the NC OneMap web site.

John Dorman noted that aerial triangulation has been completed in another block. He added that the real question is that a web service for this data, if planned, will require a lot of data storage space. He also said that local governments need to be notified that they will need to consider their storage requirements other than just storing it on a hard drive.

Dr. Mandell invited Richard Taylor to report on some developments related to the NC 911 Board and the legislature. Mr. Taylor said that the NC 911 Board is very excited about this project and recognized the degree of cooperation and hard work by the agencies involved. NC 911 is becoming a very mobile system with calls coming in not just from home land lines but from PDAs, cell phones, On-Star and other mobile technologies and this presents a huge challenge to the 911 centers because they may receive a latitude / longitude location that is not even in the county of concern. Without access to the actual location of the event, the center cannot respond. Often a call received in one jurisdiction must be forwarded to another but because of a lack of data it is difficult to identify the location of the emergency. The Board is seeking legislative changes that will help it address this situation. The Board, in cooperation with the House Select Committee which is studying the 911 fund, has prepared draft legislation that will be introduced today or tomorrow. One of the highlights of the legislation is that the Board will be able directly fund statewide projects such as orthoimagery acquisition that will benefit the entire state rather than rely on a grant process. Whether the Board does this statewide every four or five years or funds a portion of the state every year can be determined by the Board. The goal of the Board is to ensure that ortho acquisition is a recurring process in some form because as the state continues to grow, the 911 centers need updated imagery. This is a great way for the 911 Board to leverage the money that it receives to benefit everyone because this data benefits everyone – the 911 centers, local governments, state agencies and others. He believes that a cost / benefit analysis for this effort would be very positive.

Mr. Taylor noted that another concern is how to enable 911 centers to access data from adjacent counties on a real time basis rather than waiting for something to load over the Internet. He suggested some type of repository that can be accessed easily and is connected through an IT network connecting all of the 911 centers. The legislation would permit the Board to contract with a private vendor to develop that solution. There is competition within the bill such as requests by local governments to use 911 funds to purchase radios and other technology to support their first responders.

Kelly Laughton asked if NC OneMap could be redesigned and leveraged to support the data access requirements. Since the Council is working on a redesign now there is the opportunity to consider how NC One Map can be the solution. Mr. Taylor agreed that this should be taken into consideration and that it makes sense to take advantage of resources that are already in place. Dr. Mandell echoed Mr. Taylor's suggestion that funding the 911 Board's goal of acquiring new orthoimagery regularly will require creativity from the Council and that the Council and NC 911 Board may need to propose a hybrid scheme in the next long session of the legislature that includes contributions from other sources and not just the State. By leveraging other funding sources, the Council can demonstrate that it is creating a statewide coalition to accomplish its goals, which will impress the decision-makers.

Mr. Dorman asked about the language in the GIS Study that proposed that counties contribute 50%, the state 25 % and the federal government 25% of the cost of acquiring imagery and how that reconciles with the 911 Board's proposed legislation. Mr. Taylor responded that local governments can use the 911 funds allocated to local governments to acquire imagery. The money that the 911 Board is proposing to use under this legislation is from a separate pot of funds so the local government funds are actually freed up. John asked if there was any language that addresses the match funds that were proposed in the GIS Study. Mr. Taylor said the language in the proposed legislation is pretty general. Dr. Mandell said that there is the opportunity to address this issue.

Presentation: The mapAsheville Experience: A Non-Traditional Approach to Local Government GIS (see PPT at GICC website - http://ncgicc.net/Meetings/tabid/138/Default.aspx)

Jonathan Feldman, Director of IT Services for the City of Asheville, first acknowledged Jason Mann, the former GIS Manager for the City of Asheville, and his staff for their role in developing *mapAsheville*. *mapAsheville* is a set of citizen-facing GIS information portals. The three primary applications that have received the most attention from the community are the Development Mapper, Crime Mapper, and Priority Places. Development Mapper allows users and citizens to see what is going on in the community in terms of development new restaurant or proposed condos. Hot spots are displayed and the tool permits access to documents related to the planning and zoning and city council decisions that inform the community.

Crime Mapper is an application that many jurisdictions use but it lets users know what kinds of crimes are occurring and where.

Priority Places is an economic development tool that allows users to look for characteristics such as demographics, access to water and sewer and other information to inform decisions on siting businesses.

mapAsheville is also a set of internally-facing GIS / IT web applications portals to support business processes by city agencies. There is a tool for managing trash can inventory, which may sound funny until you realize how much a trash can costs and how many the city has. Another tool is the Accident Reporter that helps our traffic engineer and police department track accidents in an automated way and allows them to more efficiently do their job

mapAsheville is also a design philosophy. There are multiple applications that can be supported over the web but the reality is that GIS software is not an easy tool for most users. You cannot expect citizens and even staff professionals to master the intricacies of ESRI or other GIS software. One of the design goals was to make an application work as easily as anything on the web. The philosophy was to combine GIS best practices with II Service Management / IT Library Infrastructure (ITSM/ITIL) principles and treat GIS as a service, not just a technical discipline with the intention of rolling out focused point applications to solve specific business problems rather than simply provide access to GIS software and data.

Mr. Feldman described the approach as the "Mr. Potato Head" analogy. The *mapAsheville* framework is a lot like "Mr. Potato Head" in that there is a basic structure but lots of replaceable parts. The goal is that as the city develops new problem solving applications, it will be easier and easier to do because each new application would be built on the same basic foundation – "plug and play." In other words, write it once, use it many times.

Measuring the success of *mapAsheville* is partly based on the cost of developing and maintaining the resource. The first application was expensive to develop but each successive application was less costly because it could be plugged into the initial foundation. Another measure of success is based on its use by citizens and the internal departments. He noted that there has been about a 20% increase annually in participation. Another measure of success is outside recognition. At the 2009 NC GIS Conference, the GICC awarded *mapAsheville* of the Herb Stout Award for Visionary Use of GIS by Local Government. The city has also received the 2008 New Media Award from the International Economic Development Council (for Priority Places application) and the 2007 Marvin Collins Outstanding Planning Award for Innovations in Planning Services, Education, and Public Involvement (for the Development Mapper application). Mr. Feldman emphasized that the awards would not have come if map Asheville was simply an IT initiative. The awards came because *mapAsheville* is successful in solving business problems and that technical developers had the support of the customers and users involved in developing the various applications.

Mr. Feldman noted that another key to success is high level GIS governance. He noted that the members of the GICC understand this well. Even though the GICC does not have regulatory authority, the GICC membership includes those who can then influence activities and promote best practices within their organizations. The City of Asheville took the same approach and put together a high level steering committee to guide the process. He noted the value of good public relations, annual reports and a customer service culture that include citizens. He also emphasized the need for good data, including metadata.

Jeremy Poss asked how much of a burden was put on individual departments to change their data to get in a format that you could use it effectively in your applications. Mr. Feldman responded that the GIS governance structure and the involvement of various departments in the process led to a sense of ownership in the process, which helped to resolve many of the data problems.

Committee Reports

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

Management and Operations Committee (M&O). Dr. Mandell reiterated that as organizations mature, greater formality is needed. With so many issues before the Council, it is impossible for the Council to deal with them in the course of only four quarterly meetings. As a result, the M&O will meet more frequently. The M&O met twice in March, once in April and will meet in May and June. The M&O will then determine whether to meet monthly.

Dr. Mandell reported that Linda Rimer has been appointed by the Governor as the federal representative to the Council. Dr. Rimer is the Liaison to North Carolina and South Carolina for the US Environmental Protection Agency. As the federal appointee to the Council, Dr. Rimer will assume the role as chair of the FIC.

Dr. Mandell noted that there are proposed cuts to the US Geological Survey budget, which has the potential of affecting North Carolina. Two concerns are the potential loss of the National Geospatial Programs Office liaison to NC and cuts in federal cost share funds for orthoimagery acquisition in NC. Dr. Mandell and Mr. Fralick both wrote letters to Representative Price, whose committee handles these programs, to underscore the importance to NC and the Council's initiatives of the liaison and the matching funds.

Another issue that the M&O addressed is the Master Address Database (MADB) project, which was a project funded by the legislature at a cost of $1M and completed last year to develop a statewide address database to primarily support the 2010 census. Dr. Mandell noted that rare are the projects of this nature whose benefits do not extend beyond the narrow scope of the initial focus. Many agencies require accurate addresses and there would be great benefits to keeping the database up-to-date. Unfortunately the legislature did not provide continuation funding to keep the database up-to-date. The M&O investigated a project by the Division of Motor Vehicles, which is now required to collect property taxes for all 100 counties, an effort for which an accurate address database is critical. Staff met with DMV last year to describe the master address database developed for the census and to explore whether any synergy could be achieved between these two projects, specifically whether DMV could use the data and the data structure from the MADB project. That effort did not work out. The DMV project ran into difficulties and the project is now on hiatus.

DOT has issued an RFP for a consulting firm to make recommendations on how to proceed. Dr. Mandell reported that he has assurances from Randy Barnes, CIO at DOT, that the Council, represented by the M&O, will have the chance to be interviewed by the consultant and to propose a different approach. While the MADB is now out-of-date, the goal is to develop a mechanism to feed up-to-date data into a common statewide database, which would not only ensure a resource that everyone could use but would also remove the burden on DMV of working independently with 100 counties. If the lessons learned from the MADB project are integrated into a newly configured project early enough, and there is talk about developing a new technical design for a standalone solution, then a better solution is possible. Dr. Mandell believes that we have a fiduciary responsibility to the State to look at every opportunity to share information and to share the benefits that the state derives from GIS projects.

Two developments – the legislation affecting this Council last year and a couple of Executive Orders issued by the Governor related to boards and councils – will require that the Council revisit its bylaws and the original enabling legislation that authorizes the GICC.   The M&O therefore will be pursuing some conforming changes to the original statute to align it with changes brought about by last year's legislation and the Governor's new policies on boards. Concurrent with that will be a review of the bylaws.

ACTION #4   The M&O Committee will review the original legislation and the 2010 legislation and propose changes to the GICC's enabling legislation to ensure that it is consistent and up-to-date.

ACTION #5   The M&O Committee, with staff support, will review and recommend changes to the bylaws of the GICC and its committees.

Dr. Mandell said that a primary focus of the M&O is the NC OneMap refresh project, a task assigned by the legislation. Thanks to all who completed the survey that the TAC issued in December. The ideas that were submitted were not just long term ideas about how NC OneMap can be improved and move into a whole new generation of benefits but some things that can be accomplished in the short term. As Mr. Johnson reported earlier, staff are working on these with the idea of providing some immediate needed benefits for users and to make NC OneMap more functional. Even though we have no money for the long term refresh, we can still embark on a true project to accomplish a couple of things. The TAC and the M&O are taking a two pronged approach. One is to begin to identify the user requirements. A second is to assess the technological options that are available. Staff will also be looking at how other states are dealing with the similar issues – statewide databases, viewer, data clearinghouse, etc. Dr. Mandell said that following the visit to the Governor's Office, he was invited back in October to talk about funding of this project and at that time the Council will need hard numbers and justification – the benefits of investing money even if it is just seed money.

ACTION #6   Staff will assess how other states are acquiring, managing and providing access to geospatial data.

We want to follow good project management principles so that the vision can be immediately transferrable when funding is available. To accomplish this, the State CIO has generously offered the services of Linda Lowe from the Enterprise Project Management Office to oversee this effort. In the near future the M&O will come back to Council members and committees to seek additional input on user requirements.

Finally, the M&O is beginning work on another assignment from the legislature – preparing a statewide GIS strategy. This will encompass the NC OneMap refresh, the orthoimagery project and orthoimagery business plan and other bigger picture initiatives. With the review of the NC OneMap vision and characteristics completed, the M&O can begin considering a broader strategic analysis.

ACTION #7   The M&O will initiate efforts to prepare a statewide GIS strategy that will guide future initiatives.

Dr. Mandell indicated his pleasure with the work of the M&O and stated that it fills a real gap that he has felt acutely in his second year as chair that the Council was not making sufficient progress between meetings. He encouraged committee chairs to bring issues of concern to him or Mr. Johnson for consideration by the M&O.

John Correllus suggested that one thing that could be useful as the Council considers the NC OneMap refresh and the user requirements would be input from the vendor sector. He noted that the State CIO's office had recently issued a request for information (RFI) for information technology in general. RFI is a non-commitment for the State of NC that would allow the Council to gather information about what the vendors think about NC OneMap. An open-ended RFI could be useful in gathering information that will help the Council define the next steps. Mr. Fralick reported that a recent State CIO's Office RFI asked for comments on governance and how other vendors are solving problems related to consolidation, network services, telecommunications, and other services. The RFI asked for comments on how these solutions worked in other states or for local government. Mr. Fralick acknowledged that this approach could generate ideas for improving NC OneMap given that there is no seed money to actually contract services at this time. He views the vendor community as partners. The RFI issued by the State CIO's Office also asked for ideas on funding ideas and costs but Mr. Fralick said that, not surprisingly, the responses did not include much information on funding as vendors are reluctant to address funding in this type of forum. Mr. Correllus asked what action can be taken. Dr. Mandell said that it will be an agenda item at the next M&O meeting.

Local Government Committee (LGC). Ms. Stamper reported that the LGC made a number of suggestions for improving the vision and characteristics and that most of them were incorporated into the revised version. The LGC members have already been tasked to work with their constituencies to review and prioritize the list of 37 NC OneMap data themes.

Ms. Stamper noted that at the last Council meeting she expressed concern about Ramona and the need for better access to information about local government GIS representatives and activities. She thanked Mr. Johnson for adding a feature to NC OneMap called "GIS in NC – Who? What? Where?" It includes a list of GIS contacts for all 100 counties, a calendar of events and the results of a survey on fees that local governments charge for plotting maps. The idea is to encourage members of the GIS community to visit NC OneMap first when they have questions about GIS in NC. It does not entirely replace Ramona and additional information can be added but it is a good start.

Ms. Stamper reported that at the last LGC meeting James Armstrong, the LGC representative to the SMAC, brought up the issue of the water and sewer standard. He is doing a project to update water and sewer data for a multi-county area and, before starting, reviewed the GICC water and sewer standard. He recommended to the LGC that the standard needed to be updated. The LGC asked him to bring the issue to the SMAC's attention and he did. The SMAC has established a subcommittee to review the standard. Anne Payne, SMAC chair, will report on this later.

Federal Interagency Committee (FIC). Drew Pilant with EPA reported on behalf of FIC Vice-Chair Doug Newcomb. The FIC met on April 29 at the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge and by Webinar. There were two interesting presentations. One was by Leah Schwizer, a consultant representing the Department of Homeland Security. Her presentation was entitled "Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (HIFLD) to the Regions: Leveraging the HIFLD Model for

Regional Information Sharing Partnerships." Her presentation will be of interest to the SMAC and the TAC.

The second presentation was by John Warner with USGS on the "Carolina Coastal Change Processes (CCCP)" project. The study focuses on submarine, geologic and geomorphologic controls on erosion on the outer banks. Both presentations will be posted to the FIC page of the GICC website. There were updates on NC OneMap, the various FGDC CAP grants and a report on an EPA ecosystem services project in the Albemarle Pamlico watershed.

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC). Anne Payne reported that the Committee met on April 14. She invited subcommittee chairs to report on the activities of the various subcommittees.

Working Group for Orthophotography Planning. Gary Thompson, NC Geodetic Survey, said the working group has been very busy and has met three times since the last Council meeting. The group has been working with contractors and the Floodplain Mapping Program on the statewide orthoimagery project to review the preliminary imagery for the eastern project areas. He reported that the group is very pleased with the results and did not recommend any changes. The group will reconvene to review the imagery for the western project area when the contractors are ready.

A second focus of the group is the preparation of a business plan for statewide othoimagery. An outline is complete and the goal is to submit a draft for the Council's review at the November meeting.

The group is working on two additional documents. One is an issue paper dealing with the transformation from NAD 27 to NAD 83. There are still a few counties who are using NAD 27. The purpose of this paper is to provide the rationale for making the change. A draft will be presented at the August Council meeting. The other paper will be the issue paper on the color infrared band. This band was collected during the statewide orthoimagery project. This information paper will describe the benefits of color infrared for those counties that want to take advantage of the availability of this band and want to justify funding requests for processing the color infrared band. A final version will be submitted to the council at the August meeting.

Working Group for Seamless Parcels. Tom Morgan, co-chair of the WGSP, reported that the WGSP is meeting on its effort to develop a statewide seamless parcels database and is struggling with one section, basically land use. The group does not want to impose an unfunded mandate on local governments to generate a compatible land use classification. The group is evaluating what the Department of Revenue requires local governments to submit and is trying to determine if the group can build a request system into the seamless parcel tool that would meet these requirements. There has been good cooperation with the Department of Revenue and Mr. Morgan feels that there has been progress.

The WGSP and the WGRT are holding weekly meetings by phone conference to integrate the two projects and to document the joint business needs. Another activity is creation of a mockup of the access pages for what will appear in the software piece that the contractor will build. For example, when metadata is unavailable, the software may be able to access the parcel database and build a "lite" metadata record, admittedly not a FGDC compliant record.

One issue delaying the project is that EPA has changed their selection of the prime contractor for software development. Julia Stamper met with EPA to express WGSP's concern that a decision

be finalized so that the project can move forward.   Mr. Morgan expressed some hope that there will progress soon.

Working Group for Roads and Transportation. Janet Lowe, DOT and co-chair of the working group, reported that the WGRT has been working very closely with WGSP. The core leadership team has been meeting weekly to develop business rules for the translator that the groups are jointly working on, with potential screen shots that describe work flows. The group is also starting to develop use cases in preparation for meeting with the contractor. In addition the WGRT is soliciting volunteers for Integrated Project Technical Teams, which will focus on those pieces that are not common to the WGSP.

Ms. Lowe reported that the Eastern Carolina Council, the official recipient of the FGDC CAP grant, is awaiting final signed copies of the grant award and that a FGDC project kickoff meeting is scheduled for May 19.

Ms. Payne reported on activities of two other SMAC subcommittees. The Board on Geographic Names (BGN) received a request to rename a lake in Charlotte from Moody Lake to White Hall Lake. A similar request was denied in 2008. The reason for the request was for commercial branding by a developer that has built several developments near the lake using the White Hall name. The BGN recommended that the request again be denied and the SMAC approved that recommendation.

Ms. Payne reported that the SMAC has 'birthed' two new subcommittees, which the SMAC seems to do regularly. She reported at the February Council meeting that FGDC is conducting a public review of the draft address standard, formerly named United States Thoroughfare, Landmark, and Postal Address Data Standard.   The deadline for submitting comments is June 16. The SMAC has convened a small subcommittee of individuals from the local government community who are knowledgeable about 911 issues and addressing along with Joe Sewash from CGIA, who managed the MADB project. The subcommittee will assist in crafting a SMAC response to the proposed standard.

Ms. Payne reported that James Armstrong, the LGC appointee to the SMAC, is updating water and sewer data for the Lumber River COG. As an engaged coordination person, he consulted and used the standard that the GICC adopted in 1997. He recognized that the standard is now dated and needs to be updated and perhaps officially revised by the Council. The SMAC has convened another small subcommittee of individuals who are knowledgeable in the water and sewer utility area. The subcommittee will review the work that Mr. Armstrong has done, review the standard and make recommendations for changes to the utility standard.

Dr. Mandell said that it is his sense the Council revisits standards on a reactive basis and asked if that is the best way to handle standards. Ms. Payne acknowledged that this may not be the best approach. She noted that Jeff Brown, the CGIA Coordination Program Manager, is working with the SMAC to prepare a work plan for the coming year. Ms. Payne suggested that a regular review of GICC adopted standards could be included in the work plan.

Regarding the work plans, Mr. Johnson noted that since the Council prepares an annual report, a piece of the annual report should come from what the various committees have accomplished over the previous 12 months. This should not be an arduous effort. Work plans will enable

committees to identify objectives that can be met during the year, document them in the work plan so that progress can be tracked and then integrate them into the annual report.

On the issue of standards, Mr. Johnson noted standards should be addressed as part of the statewide GIS strategy that the Council will prepare. The GIS strategy should identify data that needs to be developed or updated and part of the strategy should be to refresh or revisit existing standards or create new standards. Given a set of data priorities, the SMAC can then identify whether a new standard needs to be developed or an earlier standard needs to be updated and in this way the SMAC will not be so reactive. Ms Payne made the point that many times the standards that the SMAC reviews are federal standards, as with the addressing standard and the National Grid. By the nature of those standards the Council has to be reactive in determining whether to adopt them or to recommend changes.

State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC). Mr. John Correllus said that the SGUC had not 'birthed' any new subcommittees but it feels like the SGUC had 'birthed' the ESRI ELA committee as the SGUC has invested considerable effort verifying the information that was submitted to the Office of Information Technology Services (OITS) in the fall. He applauded the efforts of the SGUC Executive Committee (EC) representing the various state departments for re-verifying literally thousands of licenses within a period of 7-9 days.

The SGUC EC met twice since the last Council meeting. Most of the discussion focused on the ELA but at the meeting this morning the EC began brushing the dust off of the SGUC's vision and mission statement and the goals and objectives. They still seem relevant but there will be another session next month to consider them in light of the work plans that Mr. Brown and CGIA are developing. The SGUC's plan is to establish 12 and 24 month goals and objectives and to include more meat on the plans so that the SGUC can measure progress and track benefits.

In addition, SGUC EC agency representatives and other agency representatives met with John McShane at the State CIO's Office to review the ELA and to re-validate the licenses. Mr. Correllus expressed his appreciation to Mr. McShane for his cooperation.

Two general meetings also took place since the last council meeting so the SGUC has been quite busy. The general meetings included some great presentations. The last meeting was a 'digital librarian day,' at which NC State presented their mobile application. The GeoMAPP (archives and data preservation project) team gave an in-depth presentation on the data access catalogues that Ms. Eubank described earlier. Finally Dan Madding from the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services presented on some quality control tools that could be adopted by other organizations. At the earlier general meeting there was a presentation on accountability and transparency in government and how other states are using the GIS and spatial information in that process. Finally Alan Sandoval presented some Department of Commerce tools for marketing available building and sites to economic developers around the world. The original SGUC plan to meet every other month seems to be evolving into meeting monthly.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Ms. Laughton reported that the TAC continues to work on the pre-project planning phase for the NC OneMap refresh, as charged. The TAC is developing draft questions to the GIS community to gather user requirements. She said that the TAC is looking forward to working with the State CIO's Office new project manager, Linda Lowe, who will help define the activities associated with the pre-project planning phase. The

TAC will provide whatever assistance is needed to gather the user requirements. Today Ms. Laughton submitted the list of 37 layers to the TAC members for them to review and prioritize.

Council Member Announcements and News

Ms. Stamper announced that a local government person has volunteered to work on the BP oil spill. Dr. Mandell asked what the person will do. Ms. Stamper replied "to map it." Dr. Mandell observed that it will be an ever changing task.

Mr. Johnson announced that it is not too early to start thinking about the 2011 NC GIS Conference. The conference will be held in Raleigh and contracts with the Raleigh Convention Center and the Marriott hotel are expected to be signed soon. The dates are February 16-18 with February 16 being the workshop day and February 17-18 for the conference. Staff are working on budgets and registration fees will be announced soon. Ms. Payne, Program Committee co-chair, announced that the Program Committee has already held its first meeting and asked that council members submit program ideas to her and to Tom Tribble at CGIA, the other co-chair.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be August 11, 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 Click on "Meetings." Presentations and documents presented during the meeting are available in a Zip file for easy download.