



## North Carolina Geographic Information Coordinating Council

Minutes  
August 13, 2008

### PRESENT

Chair, Dr. Lee Mandell. Members: Bob Brinson, Rodney Bunch, John Correllus, John Cox, Ryan Draughn (for Karl Knapp), Dr. Hugh Devine, Jim Dolan, John Dorman (for Bryan Beatty), John Farley, John Gillis, William Gilmore, Derek Graham, Reggie Hinton, Bliss Kite, Kelly Laughton, Bill Laxton, Dan Madding, Herb McKim, Joe McKinney, Tom Morgan (for Elaine Marshall), Doug Newcomb, Anne Payne, Jeremy Poss, Stephen Puckett, Colleen Sharpe, Julie Stamper, Richard Taylor, Rebecca Troutman, Dr. Billy Willis, 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. Dr. Lee Mandell, Chair, called the meeting to order. He introduced the Governor's new appointments to the GICC: Bob Brinson, Director CJIN, Department of Correction; Rodney Bunch, Assistant County Manager, Pasquotank County; William Gilmore, Director, Ecosystem Enhancement Program; Joe McKinney, Executive Director, Land of Sky Regional Council; Anne Payne, GIS Database Administrator, Wake County Geographic Information Service; Stephen Puckett, SD Puckett and Associates; and Colleen Sharpe, GIS Manager, City of Raleigh Information Technology. Dr. Mandell said he was appointed as Chair by the Governor. He welcomed Kelly Laughton, consultant with the Davenport Group, as a new member appointed by the Senate President *pro tempore*.

Dr. Mandell said he has appointed Bob Brinson to serve as Vice Chair, as specified in the Council bylaws. He appointed Anne Payne to serve as the Chair of the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee.

The Minutes of the May 14, 2008 meeting were approved.

#### Status and Discussion of Priorities Before Council

##### *Priority #1—NC OneMap Implementation*

Mr. Tim Johnson reported that the Governor's FY 08-09 budget included \$4 million for NC OneMap enhancements and data acquisition as well as an appropriation for eight CGIA staff

positions. House Bill 2240 (Senate 1801), “Improve State GIS/GICC Funds,” would have implemented this funding and other GIS Study recommendations. That bill was forwarded to their respective Appropriations committee. There was no funding in the final budget passed by the Legislature (House Bill 2436), but the study recommendations have been moved forward to the next legislative session through Section 6.13 of the budget bill.

Mr. Johnson provided a map showing the current connections of local governments to the NC OneMap viewer. Fourteen new web service connections were added in 2008 (13 in North Carolina, 1 in South Carolina), bringing the total connected to 58 counties, 26 cities and towns, and 6 Councils of Government. He mentioned staff has been working in partnership with Anderson and Associates, which contracts with local governments to provide GIS web services. Mr. Johnson also recognized Marcus Johnson from Warren County who was very helpful in connecting his county to NC OneMap. Dr. Mandell urged the Local Government Committee to continue to persuade counties to get linked up with NC OneMap.

Mr. Johnson said the updated layers on the NC OneMap free data download page include Natural Heritage Element Occurrences of Rare and Endangered Species, Significant Natural Heritage Areas, and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Mr. Johnson reported on a task assigned to CGIA to distill the recommendations made by Nancy Von Meyer in her presentation on seamless state parcels at the February 13 GICC meeting. The main actions include:

1. Establish a state parcel coordinator and initiate state-level coordination of parcel data.
2. Establish state coordination of the Census Bureau’s Boundary and Annexation Program.
3. Coordinate funding for parcel production.
4. Develop implementation technology for data sharing standards and have a plan to roll out the standards.
5. Establish a cadastral business plan.
  - a. Provide incentives to establish partnerships with local governments.
  - b. Identify resources needed.
  - c. Identify partnerships.
  - d. Set timelines.

Dr. Mandell referred these recommendations to the Working Group for Seamless Parcels (WGSP) to vet them and report back at the February 2009 GICC meeting. Dr. Mandell asked Mr. Johnson to disseminate these recommendations to the entire GICC membership.

ACTION 1 CGIA will distribute a summary of the recommendations made by Nancy Von Meyer at her February 2008 presentation to the Council.

ACTION 2 The Working Group for Seamless Parcels will assess the recommendations made by Nancy Von Meyer and vet them with stakeholders. The Working Group will report the results to the Council at the February 2009 meeting.

*Priority #2—Status of GIS Study Bill*

Mr. Jim Dolan provided a fact sheet on the new Legislative directive from House Bill 2436, Section 6.13. The total \$6.5 million requested by the GIS Study did not get through the House

and Senate budget processes. The new directive requires a detailed plan, due by December 1, to implement the 20 recommendations, with an emphasis on six items specified in House Bill 2436. He said written summary comments from the committees on the 20 recommendations need to be received by the end of August. Dr. Mandell said Mr. Dolan did a terrific job with the GIS Study, but this is a new opportunity for input. Aside from the legislation that created the GICC, this is the GICC's best opportunity in 15 years. Mr. John Correllus asked if Council members could consider the original recommendations and suggest wording changes and implementation ideas. Dr. Mandell said that we want constituents' ideas but that the comments need to be concise and focused. Dr. Mandell noted that this is an opportunity to put GIS on an enterprise basis in North Carolina. Mr. John Farley agreed, but that members needed more time. Mr. Correllus asked if the State Government Users Committee could have until mid-September to get draft comments. Mr. Dolan said that time was compressed on the schedule. Dr. Mandell suggested and Mr. Dolan agreed to add one more week to the deadline for comments, which takes it into the first week of September.

ACTION 3 GICC members and its committees will provide comments on the implementation of the GIS Study recommendations by September 5 to Jim Dolan of OSBM.

*Priority #3—Archival and Long Term Access ad hoc Committee*

Ms. Anne Payne, Chair of the committee, reported that the group was organized in February to consider further steps and guidelines on archiving. The group met six times and Ms. Payne thanked the members who participated. In reviewing the draft report, Ms. Payne said the committee established guiding principles for achieving archival and long term access to geospatial data:

- It has to be doable, affordable and accomplished as part of normal workflow;
- It has to be consistent with other GICC recommendations and standards;
- It has to be consistent with Dept. of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives standards;
- It should use the existing infrastructure of NC OneMap

Best practices for archiving that are consistent with the guiding principles included:

- Record retention schedules
- Use of NC OneMap data inventory
- On-line storage of archived geospatial data
- Use of shape files for vector data
- Use of GeoTIFF or TIFF with world files for raster data
- Compression of files is discouraged

The committee also suggested that best practices include use of common naming conventions, metadata, published distribution policies, published retention schedules, and periodic review of policies and data integrity. For local government data archiving, the committee recommends an annual update for extraterritorial jurisdictions, zoning, address points, utilities, and emergency E-911 themes. For the more dynamic data sets such as parcels, street centerlines and corporate limits, the committee recommended a quarterly update, or at minimum, an annual update. State government geospatial data is unique per agency and should be captured according to a record retention schedule created with the Division of Archives.

Other key recommendations include updating the retention schedule for NC OneMap, developing the capacity and expertise in the Division of Archives to guide the development of agency records retention schedules for geospatial content; and developing a plan at Division of Archives for them to handle ingest of geospatial data that results from state agency records retention schedules. Ms. Payne said it must be recognized that geospatial data are also public records and subject to records retention. She mentioned that the case studies in Appendix D of the draft report are missing, but will be added in the final report.

Dr. Mandell said this committee's work is an example of the important work of the GICC, and progress is made through collaboration. The draft report should be carefully considered by members of the GICC. He said metadata is critical for assessing archived data and has long-term value for information technology as well as GIS practitioners, especially for databases that could be integrated into GIS. He asked the Local Government Committee and the State Government GIS Users Committee especially to review the document and provide feedback to Ms. Payne.

ACTION 4 GICC members and its committees will review and comment on the draft report from Archival and Long Term Access *ad hoc* Committee. Comments will be provided back to the *ad hoc* Committee chair by October 24.

#### *Priority #4—Surveyors' Model Law Working Group*

Mr. Herb McKim, Chair of the Working Group, reported that they are generating a list of specific GIS data layers that need oversight by surveyors. The list will be presented to the NC Board of Engineers and Surveyors (NC BELS) for their review and next steps. There is a conflict at the boundaries where GIS overlaps with surveying. He added that NCBELS is now adding a GIS module option to their licensing examination. Mr. Farley asked if this decision is left up to NCBELS. Mr. McKim stated that changes of this sort are made by the legislature. Dr. Mandell asked if we are making progress. Mr. McKim said yes, there was a good dialog. Everyone recognizes that conflicts exist, but continuing dialog is important.

#### NC Master Address Dataset

Mr. Joe Sewash, Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, reported on a project to develop a master address dataset that was funded by the Legislature in the 2008 session. Mr. Sewash noted that CGIA is an affiliate of the State Data Center and that earlier in the year the Governor's Census Liaison, Bob Coats, had asked what it would take to create a master address file for the State. The US Census in April 2010 drives the timing of this project. The goals of the NC Master Address Dataset are to (1) support the 2010 US Census; and (2) support public business processes (such as redistricting, school redistricting, emergency response, voter registration, delivery of citizen services, etc.). The US Census conducts the Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) with local governments which culminates in a master census address file, but anonymity requirements (Title XIII) protect that data from distribution. The North Carolina Master Address list will give more latitude for use of the data in state government business practices.

Mr. Sewash stated that the timetable for developing an implementation plan is August 1 through October 30 of this year. This time period includes establishing an advisory committee of stakeholders and conducting three meetings with that committee. Stakeholders from across

North Carolina will consider research topics, legal issues, Title XIII, address assignment and maintenance, and data availability. The analysis phase will consider stakeholder business requirements, fiscal benefits, and recommendations for meeting both Census requirements and stakeholder needs. There will be outreach to stakeholders and GICC subcommittees. Data assembly and compilation should begin in November.

Ms. Colleen Sharpe mentioned that local governments already supplied addresses under LUCA to the Census Master Address Repository back in April. Mr. Sewash said that not every county and town in North Carolina supplies this data. Ms. Julie Stamper pointed out that although many local governments provide street addresses to the Census, the Census does not return any information to the local governments. Mr. Sewash stated that the NC Master Address project will conduct outreach to every local government and is not meant to replace LUCA, but it is a means to be independent of the restrictions of Title XIII that the Census must follow. Ms. Sharpe asked why the State of North Carolina is interested in gathering this data.

Mr. Bob Coats said the Census LUCA program is voluntary and only 78 of the 100 counties participated in April, and some cities did not participate. He mentioned that during the 2000 Census, 36 percent did not return their Census forms, leading to an undercount of North Carolina's population. He reminded the GICC that the state loses \$1,000 in federal dollars per year for each person not counted. Ms. Sharpe suggested targeting the LUCA non-response counties, and the higher population areas. Mr. Coats said address verification by the Census Bureau will begin next spring through the regional offices in North Carolina. If the state can produce a list with higher accuracy, this would be good for the Census and also good for the state because it would not be subject to Title XIII restrictions. Dr. Mandell said this could help future data products. Mr. Coats suggested that a North Carolina Master Address dataset could be updated more frequently, instead of the 10-year census cycle. It could be designed for long range data needs. Dr. Mandell said it appears to be an opportunity for local governments to get something back. Mr. Richard Taylor mentioned that enhanced 911 uses addressing and therefore has names and addresses that are shared by the telephone service providers. Ms. Sharpe mentioned that the City of Raleigh has a master address list that it gave to the Census, so why do they need this? Mr. Coats responded that the State Data Center encouraged local governments to meet the Census LUCA deadlines, and some did not respond.

Mr. Stephen Puckett said that the 911 addresses and property addresses are not necessarily the same. Ms. Sharpe confirmed that an address could refer to a building, or portion of a building. In the City of Raleigh, there could be 5 different addresses for one person. Mr. Sewash said that relative to a state database, multiple addresses could be sources. Ms. Sharpe said, for example, in the LUCA solicitation Raleigh provided a list and Wake County provided another list that also included Raleigh. Did other Wake County municipalities also provide their own address lists? She said that local government people need to be on this advisory committee. Ms. Rebecca Troutman asked who is on the advisory committee. Mr. Johnson said the committee is open and is just being formed. He noted that both producers and users need to participate in the requirements analysis.

**ACTION 5** The Local Government Committee will have representation on the NC Master Address Advisory Committee.

Mr. John Farley said that NC Department of Transportation is a major user of addresses, and some addresses are provided by local government sources. He requested that the data be accessible through a central location. Mr. Sewash said the essential requirements will come out of the path forward. Dr. Mandell said the US Census is the first priority, but the scope of the project should require that North Carolina gets something useful.

### Presentation: Hurricane Storm Surge Mapping and Other Activities in the NC Division of Emergency Management

Mr. John Dorman, director of Geospatial and Technology Management in the Department of Crime Control and Public Safety (CCPS), Division of Emergency Management said CCPS is the lead state agency in the coordination and management of hazards and threats to the state, including prevention, preparedness, incident command, response, recovery and mitigation. Local governments are the first responders, but then they call upon the state. Data the state uses must be site specific, spatial, temporal, high-resolution, and relational. He said Framework data is essential, including land parcel ownership and building structures, in order to identify hazards, threats, and vulnerabilities that are needed for assessing the probabilities and consequences in a risk analysis. Mr. Dorman mentioned that population data is a major factor in these assessments.

An important part of Floodplain Mapping Program (FMP) is the (50/50) orthophotography cost-share with local governments that must have their photography refreshed for maintenance of their flood insurance maps. Mr. Dorman pointed out that the photography can not be older than 5 years when new maps are produced. There were 17 counties flown in 2004-2005, 8 flown in 2007-2008, and 3 will be flown this coming winter flying season. Flood zone mapping for the entire state has now been completed; Ashe is the final county. The LIDAR elevation data was used to create a statewide topographic map, and 30,000 stream miles have been studied as part of the floodplain mapping effort.

The Geospatial and Technology Management Office has updated storm surge information for the coastal area and incorporated NOAA's SLOSH (Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes) computer model. Mr. Dorman said that once hazards are known, such as the extent of storm surges, then the vulnerabilities and consequences can be mapped using additional data, such as critical structures (ex. agriculture, utilities, health care, business facilities) to understand potential impacts. Mr. Dorman said that is why his agency has requested local governments to provide building footprints for every structure that is 1,000 square feet or more. Forty-nine counties have provided that data. For those counties that do not have building footprint data, FMP will digitize and return the footprint data as shape files to each county. He mentioned that this data is a building block for conducting risk analysis. FMP has created a hazard analyst tool to overlay with population, by census blocks, and state budget data so the age of the population in that area can be quickly determined to see the amount of resources that are needed in each specific area. The flood inundation mapping has been combined with real-time gauges on rivers, thus leveraging flood warning. Ms. Stamper asked if the flood inundation mapping is available to county governments. Mr. Dorman said as the counties are completed, the FMP will provide the data directly to each county and its 911 dispatch centers. Dr. Mandell asked if this data would be available through NC OneMap. Mr. Dorman responded that some of the data is not made available to the general public; therefore this data will not be on NC OneMap.

For risk analysis, the Division of Emergency Management needed a common web tool, NC SPARTA (State Preparedness and Resource Tracking Application) which is used by counties to feed information to the state so it can create a common operating picture of an incident, and produce situational awareness maps that can include overall infrastructure, and power grids, for example. This is a decision support tool. Mr. Derek Graham mentioned that a recent simulation of an evacuation exercise used FMP maps. Mr. John Gillis said that after Hurricane Katrina, MapInfo provided maps of cell phone locations of all people working on the ground as a way to keep in touch.

## Committee Reports

Council committee representatives reported on their group's activities.

### ***Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC)***

Working Group for Orthophotography Planning. Mr. Tom Morgan reported on behalf of Gary Thompson. A white paper released from the Floodplain Mapping Program, "Issue 68: Traditional Aerial Film Camera vs. Digital Camera Sensor," is in member packets. This paper gives an overview and details the differences between film and digital cameras used for orthophotography. An additional "best practices" paper, also to be written by Floodplain Mapping Program, will follow. Mr. Morgan suggested that the writers include a section on how to achieve pixel size to meet the Secretary of State's Orthophotography standard, which was adopted by the GICC.

ACTION 6 The Orthophotography Planning Working Group will provide a "best practices" paper on digital camera implementation standards to the Council at the February 2009 meeting.

There is a \$146,000 federal cost-share award for local government orthophotography (winter, leaf-off) with a focus on the coastal areas. The counties eligible this winter include Bertie, Gates, Hertford, Martin, Chowan, and Washington. Mr. Morgan recognized Steve Strader, USGS Liaison in Raleigh, for his support during the proposal development stages. NOAA is completing several LIDAR projects: one in Craven County and a bathymetry project on the New River for conducting riverine analysis. The US Department of Agriculture's NAIP summer leaf-on orthophotography is being flown across the state, now.

Mr. Morgan said that Mr. Thompson wished to ask the GICC to approve the North American Vertical Datum, NAVD88 that was discussed at previous GICC meetings and reviewed by the user committees. There were no objections from the user committees. Mr. Dorman said the Floodplain Mapping Program uses NAVD88 for its maps.

DECISION 1 The GICC adopted the North American Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD88) standard.

NC Board of Geographic Names (NCBGN). Mr. David Giordano reported that three names in North Carolina were added to the Geographic Names Information System managed by the US Board on Geographic Names: Lake Overlook, Buttermilk Creek, and Hickman Creek. At the behest of the former chair of the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee, Bill Holman, staff has researched the

NCBGN history and existing structure and is considering the representation and other changes that might be made now during the transition to a new chair. Mr. Giordano said representation on the NCBGN has not included local government, and that might be addressed, as well as adding members from a few more state agencies. The suggested changes include the appointment of the chair of the NCBGN by the Chair of the GICC, instead of through the Chair of the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee. That couples with another suggestion to elevate the NCBGN through legislation, identifying it as the State's official body for handling names. Dr. Mandell asked for members to forward nominations for the position of Chair of NCBGN.

ACTION 7 GICC members will forward recommendations for the position of Chair, North Carolina Board on Geographic Names to Tim Johnson by September 5.

Working Group for Roads and Transportation (WGRT). Ms. Janet Lowe, chair, reviewed and responded to several issues that were raised at the May GICC meeting regarding the NCStreetMap project. She mentioned the NCStreetMap did not follow the Data Sharing Committee guidelines adopted by the GICC because of timing: Work on NCStreetMap preceded the data sharing guidelines. The "Avoid Formal Agreements" data sharing guideline is implemented since producers can decide whether or not they grant unrestricted exchange of their street centerline data when it is deposited with NCStreetMap. The perception of NCStreetMap and NC OneMap as two divergent projects was addressed. Mr. Lowe said that NCStreetMap was developed to address specific issues and needs for statewide transportation data when local agencies were unwilling or unable to share data for various reasons, or objected to secondary distribution of their data, or only wanted to share data from their own website. With those limitations, NCStreetMap still fits into the NC OneMap concept because NC OneMap is defined as a comprehensive group of efforts aimed at enabling free and easily accessible sharing of spatial data, whether it is directly through the NC OneMap website, or through links to other websites that incorporate the NC OneMap brand.

Ms. Lowe said NCStreetMap is not creating a data repository in the sense of one organized database. It does provide one-stop shopping for data requestors to obtain the most current street data they need from numerous data providers, which is one of the goals of NC OneMap. A near-term goal for NCStreetMap datasets is for all data producers to provide their data based on a standard template, which would allow for easier consolidation by state agencies to create a statewide data layer. A longer-term goal would be to work with data producers to provide that information real-time as part of one integrated dataset. However, she stated, resources would have to be devoted not only to enabling technology, but to work with local governments to convert their data to a standard format. Ms. Lowe said a standard template is under production and will be added soon. She introduced the new WGRT co-chair, Alex Rickard, from Eastern Carolina Council.

Mr. Dolan asked if there were any direct links between NC OneMap and NCStreetMap. Mr. Giordano said that when a government agency signs up to share data through NCStreetMap there is an optional checkbox to make that data available through NC OneMap, therefore it is discoverable. Ms. Laughton said she would like to see NC OneMap used as the spatial data backbone and not fragment into separate services. Dr. Mandell said lack of money sometimes stands in the way. He asked if the NCStreetMap effort could aid the Master Address project. Ms. Lowe mentioned that street addresses do exist in street centerlines as well as parcels; and there are lots of overlaps and challenges. Mr. Correllus said the commitment should be to build NC OneMap, but it must stay on the cutting edge of technology. Mr. Farley said NC DOT can break the current backbone of NC OneMap, but that DOT has a mission and must move ahead based on what it can do: Later we can



think about integration. Ms. Laughton asked why projects can not be leveraged so we can reallocate resources to contribute to NC OneMap's development.

Mr. Correllus said from a data warehouse perspective, we need to think about GIS and funding to make progress on NC OneMap. Dr. Billy Willis said almost all data has geospatial significance, but it has not been captured. At some point we have to figure out how the data warehouse comes together. The Legislature provided \$10 million as a 5-year cost for integrating state data. The Office of Information Technology Services has to choose what data has value, and who pays for it. There is not enough money to make NC OneMap faster. When the GICC focuses on the next data layer, we need to achieve more agreement and take on a little more risk. He said Jim Dolan has to get past the stops in the GIS Study. Mr. Dolan replied that there is money proposed for building data layers, but noted that the proposed \$250,000 for architecture and technical solutions should eliminate some of these NC OneMap problems. Ms. Stamper replied that small counties have money problems, too. Dr. Willis agreed but noted that Ms. Stamper's concern is a money problem, not a technical problem.

Working Group for Seamless Parcels (WGSP). Mr. Tom Morgan, co-chair of the Working Group mentioned that Mr. David Wyatt representing the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians will be joining the group. Mitchell County is the only county in North Carolina without GIS and parcel data. Parcels are now being mapped in Hyde County. There are six counties with no Internet presence, but CGIA has offered to include their data on NC OneMap if they choose. The Working Group is focused on three topics.

First, it will solicit information from all 100 counties on their policies for data sharing, their hardware and software platforms. The NC OneMap GIS Inventory tool has already gathered information for many of the counties, and more responses will be added in this process. All counties will be asked to answer a few parcel-related questions, written for this solicitation, when they enter the NC OneMap GIS Inventory to create or update their record.

Regarding the seamless parcel layer for the state, Mr. Morgan pointed out that the Public Records Law granted an exception to local governments to restrict use of their GIS data and charge a reasonable fee for distribution, if they choose. The state, on the other hand, must provide GIS data when requested since it does not have this legal exception. This is a dilemma for county rights. The committee will discover how many counties actually use the exception and how to address their concerns.

The third item Mr. Morgan brought up was whether the GICC should support a grant application to build a parcel exchange node as part of the US Environmental Protection Agency's exchange network. This funding source was brought up late last year when the application was due and the NC Property Mappers Association (NCPMA) and the Local Government Committee felt that there was not enough time to explore the grant. The WGSP co-chairs met with the executive board of NCPMA on July 30, 2008 and presented the grant opportunity again. The NCPMA board voted to write a letter of support for preparing the grant package, but reserved final support until they could review the proposal. Mr. Morgan said the Office of the Secretary of State also supports the preparation of the grant proposal. Several agencies have indicated willingness to assist the effort: Department of Environment and Natural Resources IT/GIS, Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, Department of Agriculture Emergency Programs, and the Land Records Management Section of the Office of the Secretary of State.

The proposed pilot would involve 6 to 10 counties and one Council of Government to provide sufficient participation to validate the results. Four counties and one COG have volunteered.

The grant is \$300,000, unless we team with other states, in which case the award could be \$500,000. The purpose of the grant is to provide a secure network where GIS parcel data can be imported from counties at scheduled intervals, integrated into a statewide data set, and available to state, local and federal agencies. Mr. Morgan said this effort augments NC OneMap and is not a replacement. It will take several years to see the benefit of this proposal, if it is awarded. Mr. Morgan asked for the support of the GICC before moving forward with grant preparation, and said the proposal would be presented to the GICC for a final decision of support.

Ms. Payne said this is a continuation of the data repository model and does not sound like it is set up for sharing with NC OneMap. Mr. Dolan said he would want to see the proposal. Dr. Mandell said the application must work into NC OneMap, or it could not be supported. Mr. Farley said if NC OneMap cannot currently support the goals of parcel data sharing, then special projects like this are required until NC OneMap is funded. Ms. Laughton repeated her point that we need to consolidate the limited financial resources that are available to support the vision of NC OneMap. Mr. Morgan said the number of local government calls from numerous state agencies for parcel data is problematic. Ms. Stamper said to remember that some local governments do not have the technology to be in NC OneMap. Mr. Morgan said there will be some levels of data not accessible to the general public in this proposal. Mr. Farley said this is a grant application to create another repository. Ms. Sharpe asked why we need another repository. Mr. Morgan said the proposal can bring NC OneMap into the mix and CGIA, as staff to the Council, will be working on the proposal, too. Dr. Willis said that we should pursue the federal dollars and work to fit it into NC OneMap. The NC OneMap ideal is that “everyone can see everything,” and that can be an impediment. We must recognize the reality of restricted access. Instead of building a separate repository, let’s fix NC OneMap. NC OneMap may not have the technology behind it, but it can be fixed. He said he does not like another repository being added.

Ms. Sharpe repeated that the legal public records exception for local government’s GIS and the absence of any exception for the state agencies is an impediment. Dr. Willis noted that the data belongs to the county and that the state is only a steward of the data, not the owner. Could this not justify a restriction on the state for sharing local data? He said that we need to identify the barriers to the vision of NC OneMap and pick them off.

**DECISION 2** The Working Group for Seamless Parcels should move forward with preparation of the EPA Exchange Network grant proposal and ensure that integration with NC OneMap is addressed in the proposed scope of work.

**ACTION 8** The Working Group for Seamless Parcels should submit the final EPA Exchange Network proposal to the GICC for review leading to an endorsement decision by the Council.

***State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC).*** Mr. John Correllus said the SGUC is very pleased that the ESRI Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with the State of North Carolina was funded in the current budget, at a cost of \$597,000, which translates into large savings for the

individual departments. The ELA was a five-year agreement that will end in 2010. Mr. Correllus said North Carolina is only one of two states that have an ELA with ESRI for the ArcGIS software products. The latest release of ESRI ArcGIS version 9.3 licenses has been distributed to agencies. Ms. Laughton said that local governments were not permitted to participate in the ELA when it was established. Dr. Willis said the state would need to have a financial recovery model for local governments if they were allowed to participate in a future ELA. Ms. Payne mentioned that ESRI does not have a reasonable model for a local government Enterprise License Agreement. Doug Newcomb asked whether the ELA dictated exclusive use of ESRI software and how often the state addresses its GIS software requirements. Dr. Willis said the ELA with ESRI does not make it the exclusive choice for state GIS software, but the ELA allows the state to make a volume purchase.

The SGUC Executive Committee is meeting monthly instead of quarterly. The SGUC listserv has been launched to more than 200 state employees as a means of communication on SGUC and GICC matters. He said the SGUC has been reviewing the 20 GIS Study recommendations detailed in House Bill 2240 and will provide input by the deadline for the implementation plan now required under House Bill 2436, section 6.13. Mr. Dolan said that a focus will be on money saved from consolidation, from the standpoint of agency organization and data development. Dr. Willis said that the implementation plan for GIS Study recommendations should address what should be available through appropriation to business budgets of these agencies, what should be provided as a service; and whether there be an amount each state agency contributes to fund the 20 recommendations. Also, what should be available as developmental services to assist local governments to develop competency. Mr. Farley said to focus money on NC OneMap and the expertise it needs to advance.

**Local Government Committee (LGC).** Ms. Julie Stamper said the LGC met July 24. The LGC was tasked by the Public/Private Partnership *ad hoc* Committee to consider incentives for local governments to adhere to standards. The LGC appointed a subcommittee, chaired by Amy Durden from Elizabeth City. Ms. Stamper referred to a handout that reviewed the three incentives: Educational opportunities, taught by personnel from CGIA or NC OneMap staff, to transfer knowledge to counties on how to comply with standards; a hotline to NC OneMap or CGIA to get assistance with technical problems; and, monetary incentives such as grants or cost-share opportunities. The recommendations from the LGC include education and outreach about the standards and where to find them; models from local governments that are adhering to a standard and documentation, such as a how-to book from a successful organization; and using two approaches to local governments, top-down through NC League of Municipalities and NC Association of County Commissioners to city and county managers who can push information down to multiple departments, and/or using a key-contact approach in each agency who is responsible for promoting adherence to standards within their organization.

Ms. Stamper said that money helps as an incentive. Many local governments are poorly financed and poorly trained on using standards. She mentioned that the orthophotography cost-share has been successful, but cost-share money should be given even if county does not participate in standards, and they should be able to get free support from CGIA. Mr. Madding noted that the orthophotography cost-share agreements do not require local governments to follow standards, other than the LRMP orthophotography standard. Mr. Stamper agreed, but reported that she is hearing things outside the Council about the possibility of imposing other standards on local governments before they can receive orthophotography cost-share funds. Ms. Payne said that education and outreach are very important, there is still more to be done with the

Data Sharing recommendations; for example, and we need to do a better job as the GICC in taking the message back. Dr. Mandell agreed that all members need to make efforts at outreach.

Ms. Stamper said she was caught by surprise with Mr. John Dorman's presentation that indicated the Floodplain Mapping Program was contacting local governments for building footprints. She suggested that he go through the GICC and the Local Government Committee for assistance and coordination, particularly since building footprints is one of the 37 priority data themes for NC OneMap. Mr. Dorman noted her remark.

***Federal Interagency Committee (FIC).*** Doug Newcomb reported that the committee is without a chair, to be appointed by the Governor. The next meeting is scheduled for September 16.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Johnson mentioned the 2009 NC GIS Conference will be held February 19-20 at the Raleigh Convention Center, which marks a return to Raleigh after six conferences in Winston-Salem.

Dr. Mandell said he was very interested in ideas for future presentations to the GICC. He encouraged the members to suggest ideas about GIS usage, and especially mash-ups that are occurring in agencies.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be November 19, 2008 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.