



North Carolina Geographic Information Coordinating Council

Minutes

May 8, 2019

PRESENT

Alex Rankin (Chair), Steve Averett, Paul Badr, Kathryn Clifton, Jason Clodfelter, Michael Cline (for Bob Coats), John Correllus, John Cox, Stan Duncan, Dianne Enright, Sarah Wray (for John Farley), Kristian Forslin, Chloe Gossage, Dean Grantham, Joanne Halls, Gerry Means (for Pokey Harris), Jason Hedley, Matt Helms, Bliss Kite, Sarah Koonts, Doug Newcomb (for Scott Lokken), Dan Madding, Elaine Marshall, Hope Morgan, Caitlin Saunders (for Chris Nida), Allan Sandoval, Frank Sculetta (for Wesley Beddard), Tony Simpson and Ron York

Staff: Tim Johnson, CGIA

ABSENT

David Baker, Greg Cox, Seth Dearmin, John Gillis, Debbie Joyner, and Lee Worsley

PROCEEDINGS

A meeting of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council was held in Training Room 245 of the Albemarle Building, 325 N. Salisbury, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Welcome and Chair Announcements

Alex Rankin, Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed Council members and visitors.

Mr. Rankin announced that the 2018 GICC Annual Report was delivered to the Governor and the General Assembly last month, and it is now available on the GICC [website](#). He encouraged members to view it. Regarding committees, Mr. Rankin appointed Cam McNutt of the Department of Environmental Quality to serve a two-year term as chair of the NC Board on Geographic Names, starting in July.

With respect to North Carolina and national organizations, he announced that the Department of the Interior has [appointed](#) 12 individuals to serve on the National Geospatial Advisory Committee. These individuals will provide advice and recommendations on, among other things, implementation of the Geospatial Data Act of 2018. Among the appointees are Gary Thompson, Chief of the NC Geodetic

Survey. Those 12 will serve three-year terms along with up to 30 other members serving in staggered terms.

Tim Johnson was appointed to the office of Secretary of the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) last October. NSGIC is the association for state GIS directors and coordinators. North Carolina was an organizing member of NSGIC in the early 1990s.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 13, 2019 meeting were approved for adoption with no changes.

Presentations

1. Next Generation 911 GIS Project (Gerry Means)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-NextGen911-GIS-Update20190508.pdf>

Mr. Rankin introduced Gerry Means, Network Engineer for the NC 911 Board who is the Project Manager for both the Next Generation 911 network and the geospatial data for NextGen911. He conveyed Pokey Harris' regrets that she is out today with an illness. He explained that North Carolina is one of the leading states in the deployment of NextGen911 technology. Legacy 911 communications rely on a connections-based infrastructure and have been in use for decades. In the past, telecommunication carriers have served a locally controlled enterprise with many vendors involved with the state's 127 primary and secondary Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). Today, North Carolina is implementing an Internet-Protocol (IP) based system using the latest technology, guided by standards of the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), and designed for statewide application and nationwide interoperability. In the next system, the 114 primary PSAPs are landing points for 911 calls.

Mr. Means explained that a statewide structure will normalize call answering and provide consistency in service. NextGen911 creates a standard network specifically for public safety that is driven by the caller location. GIS plays a huge role in NextGen911 to locate callers and support regional approaches. In the event of a storm like Hurricane Florence that put New Hanover County's PSAP out of operation, NextGen911 will enable calls from locations in the affected county to be directed to open PSAPs in the region or even to the western part of the state to be sure all calls are answered. This approach supports any number of "what-if" scenarios, supports flexibility in staffing emergency communications, and reduces overall operating costs.

Community engagement has involved a series of regional meetings and will include visits to individual PSAPs. Most PSAPs (115 of 127) are on board. The NC911 Board is developing the network (ESINet) and a hosted call solution on state contract at no direct cost to the counties or municipalities. Implementation goals are 40 PSAPs by the end of 2019 and 100 percent migration to the network by the end of 2021. With thanks to Ben Shelton of CGIA, the NC 911 Board's website features a [status map](#) of deployment. PSAPs are color coded as (1) accepted into the project and in the process of preliminary engineering, (2) active projects expected to be completed by the end of 2019, and (3) in operation today.

Mr. Means described the role of GIS in NextGen911 in North Carolina. NextGen911 needs to know the location of the call. The system includes a geographic data repository, to be developed and

managed by GeoComm, the vendor recently awarded a contract. He pointed out the 98% and higher accuracy level required (percent of calls with an accurate location). FCC requires carriers to identify the location of a wireless call within 100 feet of the actual location; that requirement will tighten to 3 meters in two years. An altitude requirement will be added by 2022. The repository includes normalization—translation of local government data to data content standards. The caller location information will be transferred to AT&T’s system for verifying the location and routing the call to a PSAP. GeoComm and AT&T are delivering managed services under seven-year contracts.

NENA’s i3 standard defines a dataset for call routing to be implemented statewide. Mr. Means added that Durham has implemented text communication for 911. All the information can be transferred with a call to a responder or another PSAP. He emphasized that average call connection speed is now 0.5 second compared to 10 to 12 seconds in legacy systems.

The project kick-off for the NextGen911 GIS effort was April 16, 2019. Two PSAPs will be pilots for geospatial data – Durham and Richmond counties. Regional sessions begin June 4 and continue through June 25.

He explained that GeoComm will install and configure a GIS Data Hub for data uploads, with ongoing quality control. GeoComm will manage statewide aggregated datasets and updates, and changes will be delivered to AT&T. Boundary layers are important, especially service delivery polygons, for the geospatial database. He added that mobile PSAPs can be used for large events like a convention and a service area can be defined around the event temporarily to route calls to the mobile PSAPs.

During questions and answers, Mr. Means added more information.

- The wireless carriers are responsible for generating a point for each caller location in latitude/longitude that meets FCC accuracy standards, which can include 5G networks.
- GeoComm has provided the geospatial data services in other states including Texas, California, and Washington in a managed service approach with a service level agreement. There are performance provisions and an option for an additional three-year term.
- The project does not yet include military installations, but that is being explored.
- The new i3 system integrates with existing Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) systems. A local GIS data manager will provide data to the geospatial repository for Next Generation 911 and will not need to deliver the same datasets to PSAPs.
- PSAPs will see the normalized data in the system. PSAPs will receive a call location in their CAD systems and view the location along with vector data and imagery depending on the specific CAD system.

Mr. Johnson added that GeoComm will implement a “distributor” tool as a way to share data with state agencies to meet other state business needs.

Also, he thanked Mr. Means, Ms. Harris and the NC 911 Board for approving the next four-year cycle of orthoimagery for the state. In addition, the Board unanimously approved a new line item to produce color infrared imagery during the same acquisition cycle.

2. *Public Access to Geospatial Data Representing Infrastructure* (Jason Clodfelter, Hope Morgan and Jessica Middlebrooks)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Public-Access-to-Geospatial-Representations-of-Local-Government-Utility-Data-20190508.pdf>; <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Data-Availability-Policy-from-Utility-Partners-20190508.pdf>; <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Overview-of-Council-Role-and-Certain-Applicable-Laws-20190508.pdf>

Mr. Rankin called on Jason Clodfelter, chair of the Local Government Committee (LGC) to lead off the three-part presentation. He described a survey conducted by the LGC and explained that the purpose was to determine local jurisdictions that own/operate utilities, determine public access to those utility geospatial data, and learn about local data distribution and/or non-disclosure agreements. The survey was distributed via listservs, including NC GIS, NC Local Government Information Systems Association, NC Property Mappers Association, NC Association of Public Works Administrators, and a list for NC county and city managers. Respondents tended to be GIS coordinators or public works managers. From mid-November to December 31 of last year, the survey collected 63 responses from municipalities (47.6 percent), counties (36.5 percent), and regional organizations (15.9 percent). The responses represented a mix of larger and smaller municipalities and counties. This was the first survey on this topic by the GICC.

Regarding water and sewer systems, Mr. Clodfelter presented a summary table of results. He noted that a more detailed report was submitted to the GICC Chair. The majority of the respondents had geospatial representations of water and sewer facilities, and the majority did not provide public access to geospatial datasets. About half of the respondents provided data only by request, and fewer than half distributed data outside of a government entity. The data restrictions applied to facilities such as distribution pipes and to service area delineations. He added that in his experience, public works data managers may restrict access to other departments in the same jurisdiction. The vast majority of systems had no written policy regarding distribution of water and sewer system geospatial data.

Looking at municipalities, 67 percent of the responding municipalities owned and operated an electric utility. Of those, 70 percent did not distribute geospatial data to the public. Less than one percent had a written policy for data distribution.

From a county perspective, 30 percent of the county respondents had one or more municipalities in the county that own and operate an electric utility. Only 26 percent answered that they were able to obtain geospatial data for any part of local utility infrastructure; 30 percent answered “no” and 44 percent answered “NA.”

Regarding data sharing agreements, only 14 percent of respondents had an agreement with internal and/or external entities. The survey asked for open-ended comments for or against public access to infrastructure data. Some respondents favored public access to infrastructure data for value to data users. Others pointed to homeland security concerns and perceived risk to the public as reasons for restricting data access.

Hope Morgan presented the second part of the report on public access to infrastructure data. From her experience in the NC Emergency Operations Center, she is in the process of looking at data availability policies of private utility companies before, during and after emergency events. In the

context of the GICC and the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC), Ms. Morgan is posing questions to private companies about policies and procedures.

Data sharing can be mutual in emergency situations. Ms. Morgan is pointing out the potential for access to State tools that may be valuable to private utilities, including access to NC SPARTA and the Flood Inundation Mapping and Alert Network (FIMAN), as well as access to damage assessment data after an event.

Ms. Morgan is reaching out to power companies, natural gas companies, water systems and NC WaterWARN (water sharing), and telecommunications including NC 811 (one call for digging). She is starting with companies that are members of the State Emergency Response Team (SERT), but as Jason Hedley pointed out, there may be other utilities not on SERT that could be consulted. Ms. Morgan added that she seeks information on specific datasets under emergency situations as well as “sunny day” conditions. So far, she is learning that data requests tend to be handled on a case-by-case basis. More information is forthcoming.

Jessica Middlebrooks, Deputy General Counsel at the NC Department of Information Technology assigned to the GICC, presented the third of three parts on public access to infrastructure data. She researched and summarized the legal context for sharing or restricting access to infrastructure data.

Regarding North Carolina General Statutes, the enabling legislation for the GICC and CGIA is G.S. § 143B-1420 entitled, “Council established; role of the Center for Geographic Information and Analysis.” Subsection (a) of this provision includes the Council’s role in developing policies and “coordination, direction, and oversight of State, local, and private GIS efforts.”

The data-related mandate is found in subsection (b), which provides in pertinent part,
“CGIA shall manage and distribute digital geographic information about North Carolina maintained by numerous State and local government agencies. It shall operate a statewide data clearinghouse and provide Internet access to State geographic information.”

This ties into CGIA requests for geographic information from local governments. She emphasized that managing and distributing data is a mandatory requirement for CGIA and the statute authorizes CGIA to request and receive geographic information from state and local agencies. In the event of an agency denying a data request by CGIA, the agency should be able to articulate why.

Wording in other North Carolina statutes may cause confusion or reluctance by local agencies to provide requested geographic information. She pointed out a reference to “infrastructure facilities” in G.S. § 132-1.7 entitled, “Sensitive public security information” that provides as follows:

“(a) Public records, as defined in G.S. 132-1, shall not include information containing specific details of public security plans and arrangements or the detailed plans and drawings of public buildings and infrastructure facilities or plans, schedules, or other documents that include information regarding patterns or practices associated with executive protection and security.”

The term “infrastructure facilities” has not been interpreted in North Carolina case law or statutory law. However, she found that the University of North Carolina’s School of Government, a well utilized resource for local governments, has defined infrastructure facilities as including:

“utility facilities owned by local governments such as water or sewer lines, treatment plants, water supply reservoirs, ... airport facilities, streets and highways, parking structures, dams, and communication lines owned or used by local governments” and other categories.

The Public Records Law includes language about GIS in G.S. § 132-10 entitled, “Qualified exception for geographical information systems.” Geographic information systems are public records within the meaning of the chapter, and

“The County or city shall provide public access to such systems...”

The concept of data access includes the provision:

“Upon request, the county or city shall furnish copies, in documentary or electronic form, to anyone requesting them at reasonable cost.”

Reasonable cost has not been defined, but guidance indicates that the cost does not include salaries or database creation. It goes on to say that as a condition,

“a county or city may require that the person obtaining the copy agree in writing that the copy will not be resold or otherwise used for trade or commercial purposes.”

If a local government chooses to require such an agreement, it is allowed by law. Further, the statute lists purposes that are exceptions to “trade or commercial purposes”: publication or broadcast by the news media, real estate trade associations, or Multiple Listing Services; or use of information by a licensed professional. The latter has been interpreted broadly to include licensed professionals and members of certain trades requiring expertise in the field.

The concept of infrastructure facilities appears again in the General Statutes, “§ 132-11. Time limitation on confidentiality of records.” It states in subsection (c):

“No provision of this section shall be construed to authorize or require the opening of any record that meets any of the following criteria:

...

(5) Contains detailed plans and drawings of public buildings and infrastructure facilities.”

The same terminology is not found in federal law. Ms. Middlebrooks found language about “critical infrastructure” in the “Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107-296 – Nov. 25, 2002, Title II.”

The definition of “critical infrastructure” is broad:

“information not customarily in the public domain and related to the security of critical infrastructure or protected systems...”

The Act requires a federal directive. She pointed to “Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7: Critical Infrastructure, Identification, Prioritization, and Protection.” This directive includes “critical infrastructure” and applies to state, county, municipal and regional governments.

She concluded that North Carolina statutes indicate a need to balance access to geographic information and protection of sensitive information that would put citizens at risk. The only NC Case Law related to geographic information is *Whitehurst v. Alexander County*, 2016 N.C. App. 329 (2016) where the opinion is that geographic information may be used as evidence, in this case, images of trees. To date, there have not been cases to define what certain geographic information terms mean and include.

She encouraged Council members to think through the state statutes concerning data access and data restriction, keeping in mind the authorization to continue to manage and distribute geographic information under the mandated roles of the Council and CGIA.

Discussion raised an example where a state agency signs a data sharing agreement with a local government. Is the state agency compelled to release the data as a public record or can the state agency also restrict access? Ms. Middlebrooks advised a practice of reviewing all data received from a local government to separate sensitive information from non-sensitive information before releasing data. She also noted that NC 811 operates under a separate authorizing statute regarding infrastructure information, and the private entity does not provide access to designs and plans.

3. *Municipal Boundaries: Progress Report* (Elaine Marshall)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Municipal-Boundaries-Update-20190508.pdf>

Secretary Marshall reminded the Council that Deputy Secretary of State, Haley Haynes, presented to the GICC on May 9, 2018 and described a compelling need for more complete, consistent, timely local government submissions of annexation documents to the Secretary of State. She has no carrot and no stick regarding annexation compliance. Accurate municipal boundaries promote accurate population counts for the Census and fair distribution of federal and state funds that go out to municipalities. At that meeting, Ms. Haynes requested help from the Council given the importance of geospatial data to represent municipal boundaries. Secretary Marshall was pleased that the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee formed the Working Group for Municipal Boundaries last summer, and she thanked the Council for making municipal boundaries one its priorities for 2019.

Secretary Marshall explained the current GIS situation and showed an example from Cooleemee in Davie County where three sources have three different representations of a northern part of the city limits. The sources are downloadable data from Davie County, Powell Bill municipal boundaries from NCDOT, and Census Place boundaries from the Census Bureau. These differences are less than 200 feet in the example, but they are apparent where the mapping is more or less generalized depending on the source materials. She pointed out that in many locations, the local, state and federal sources are in agreement, especially in recently annexed portions of municipalities where base mapping sources may be superior to older boundary sources.

She added that the quality of maps submitted with annexation documents, received by the Secretary of State, are of variable quality. She displayed an example of an “accurate map” as referenced in the statute from the 1970s. This example lacked a legend, a north arrow, or any clues about what the lines and colors represented. A geospatial representation of annexation boundaries, preferably a digital survey plat, is needed with annexation submissions. In 2018, the Secretary of State received 900 annexations.

Secretary Marshall reported good progress as the Working Group, co-chaired by Bob Coats and John Bridgers, found that improvements are within reach in a four-part solution. Collaboration is underway on the four parts. Communication, promotion and cajoling are the favored approaches this year. The Working Group has identified rules and statutes that may need to be modified in 2021 if the guidance/promotion/communication approach needs reinforcement. By that time, the business case for strengthening and clarifying mandates will be easier to quantify and describe.

The four parts of a solution are interrelated:

1. Create a baseline dataset for municipal boundaries from the best available mapping sources – local, state, and federal.
2. Improve the source maps that are created for annexations to improve the quality of updates to municipal boundaries.
3. Modify annexation data flows to take advantage of county data sharing capabilities.
4. Maintain the statewide municipal boundary data based on annexation data.

In the coming months, NC DIT-Transportation is leading the creation of a baseline municipal boundaries dataset from the best available sources, in collaboration with CGIA. NC Geodetic Survey will work with NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors and others to promote minimum requirements for digital submissions of surveyed annexation boundaries to improve the source data submitted to the Secretary of State. The Land Records Management Program worked with selected counties and concluded that a data flow for annexation maps and documents from counties on behalf of municipalities in the county is a practical solution for statewide application. This is valuable for the annual Boundary and Annexation Survey (BAS) with the Census Bureau.

State agencies will collaborate on maintenance of the statewide municipal boundary dataset, based on annexation data, to be published through NC OneMap, with details to be determined. The Working Group will continue to develop the baseline data, improve source data, improve the data flow from local to state, and communicate and promote the solutions. The plan for 2020 is to evaluate the quality of the data flows and consider if more teeth are needed to realize potential, with an eye toward the next long legislative session in 2021. She thanked the working group and offered more information through the Land Records Management Program.

In discussion, Ron York expressed gratitude on behalf of Duke Energy for what the State of North Carolina already does with boundary data. Duke Energy depends on municipal boundaries to collect tax revenues for the state and the municipalities and to pay property taxes correctly. North Carolina, one of seven states in the Duke Energy service territory, is far ahead of the other states for complete, correct boundary data. Secretary Marshall added that municipal boundaries have many more applications, for example in business licensing and voting.

Working Group on PLS and GIS

Tim Johnson gave a report on the Working Group for Professional Land Surveying (PLS) and GIS. The working group was created by the GICC in 2016 to work with the North Carolina Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCBEES) to define GIS and the scope of engineering and surveying in relation to GIS. Work has included review of legislation governing PLS and GIS activities in North Carolina. The group has worked to bring clarity to related issues. Next steps will be to make recommendations to the GICC and communicate results to the broader community including public and private sector GIS practitioners.

The working group did a lot of work to create a set of “use cases” as a vehicle for discussing how GIS work is done, and how it compares to the work of Professional Land Surveyors. The group prepared 40 use cases, then narrowed the set to 22 cases for discussion between representatives of working group and members of NCBEES Surveying Committee. The working group members who made up the use case task group were Kat Clifton, John Farley, Kent Rothrock, Bob Brinson, Alex Rankin and Tim Johnson. The task group met with the Surveying Committee a half dozen times to review the use cases in detail. The meetings included clarification of terminology used by GIS professionals and surveyors, such as “spatial analysis” that had quite different meanings in the two professions. The meetings included lengthy, sometimes tedious, discussions about each use case to reach understandings of what represented a GIS activity and what required a PLS license.

Mr. Johnson explained that each of the 22 use cases had a description and an initial recommendation from the task group. Where applicable, references to NC General Statutes or National Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCEES) Model Rules were included. After discussion with the Surveying Committee, recommendations were confirmed or modified. He observed that some use cases were clear, where determining a location is done for a legal purpose and should be performed by a surveyor. Other use cases were clearly a GIS practice, such as creating an inventory of features not intended for engineering or design purposes.

The working group also identified other types of licensed professionals who may have some overlap with GIS practice—the NC Board of Architecture, NC Board of Landscape Architects, NC Board for the Licensing of Geologists, NC State Board of Registration for Foresters, and the NC Wildlife Resources Commission. Outreach is planned.

Mr. Johnson observed that some use cases depend on the stated purpose of a dataset, but data may be used for an unintended purpose. This understanding led to the development of a disclaimer for GIS products. Last month, the full working group recommended modifications to the disclaimer. The final wording needs to be worked out in collaboration with the Surveying Committee. The disclaimer is included in the summary document that is now available on the GICC website either on the [working group](#) page or the page for this Council [meeting](#).

The working group recommends that the Council get additional comments on the report from the geospatial community, including professional organizations represented on the Local Government Committee—including Carolina URISA, the Property Mappers Association, NC Local Government Information Systems Association, American Planning Association, and the NC Association of Regional Councils of Government. Mr. Johnson asked the Council for advice on ways to reach GIS practitioners in private organizations who may not be on contact lists. The working group will review comments and sharpen recommendations before the August Council meeting. Council staff will communicate invitations to comment, with a June 15 deadline.

Looking ahead, the working group recommends holding an annual meeting between GICC and NCBEES. The group also recommends communicating to GIS practitioners that NCBEES has an option to apply for a license as a Professional Land Surveyor in Mapping Sciences. On the Council, Hope Morgan has more information on PLS requirements. Mr. Johnson added that the working group discussed the concept of a licensing board for GIS practice, a topic that needs more consideration.

Census 2020 and Geospatial Data – New Construction

Michael Cline, State Demographer in the Office of State Budget and Management, gave an overview of the 2020 Census. A Complete Count Committee is actively promoting the Census. He pointed to the State’s “Make NC Count” [website](#) for information.

The next major program for local governments is the “New Construction” program for all municipalities, counties and federally recognized tribes. This is an opportunity to update address lists to include new construction expected to be completed by Census Day, April 1, 2020. This involves new single-family housing units, multi-family housing units, group quarters facilities (nursing homes, dormitories, workers’ housing, etc.), and transitory locations (homeless and emergency shelters, campgrounds, etc.).

Local governments may submit using US Census Bureau GUPS software or using their own GIS. Mr. Cline emphasized the importance of each local government registering for the New Construction Program now—the deadline for registration is June 14, 2019. More information is available: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about/NewConstruction>

New Construction Program materials will be distributed to participants in September 2019 when training webinars will begin. November 22, 2019 is the final deadline for submitting addresses. In December 2019, the Census Bureau will send closeout materials to participants.

Committee Reports

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC). Paul Badr, SMAC Chair, reported that SMAC met on April 17 and covered numerous updates from managers of Geospatial Framework datasets as well as chairs of working groups. Highlights that have not been discussed already in this meeting are the following.

- The 2022 Reference Frame and implications for state plane coordinates continue to be discussed by Gary Thompson and reported to SMAC.
- Project Manager Ben Shelton reported that Statewide Orthoimagery acquired imagery in the 21-county Southern Piedmont and Mountains region by early April. Imagery processing by the vendors is in progress and quality control will take place this summer.
- Project Manager Hope Morgan reported that LiDAR data quality review for Phase 5 of 5 is complete, subject to final review by project partner USGS. Data release is expected in about two months. Also, a method is in place for production of contour data derived from digital elevation models. Ms. Morgan added that LiDAR for Phase 5 is now available for download.
- The Working Group for Land Cover, chaired by Kenneth Taylor, completed its report on business needs for land cover data and will define a data product to recommend to SMAC.
- The Hydrography Working Group, chaired by Cam McNutt, presented more detail on a statewide dataset for streams by NCDOT’s ATLAS project. The group will evaluate the data and revisit stewardship opportunities with the National Hydrography Dataset.

The next SMAC meeting will take place on July 17.

Federal Interagency Committee (FIC). Doug Newcomb reported on behalf of Scott Lokken, FIC Chair. FIC met at the NC GIS Conference and prepared for a meeting in Asheville on May 16. There

will be presentations by National Geodetic Survey on emergency preparedness, NOAA on coastal land cover data and methods, and updates from each participating agency.

Local Government Committee (LGC). Jason Clodfelter, LGC Chair, reported that the committee met on March 13. In addition to work on infrastructure data, LGC responded to Gary Thompson regarding his request for comments on the 2022 Reference Frame and state plane coordinates, asking about potential impacts on local governments. Mr. Thompson also offered information about how local governments can plan for the transition. Also, there are three local government representatives on the new Working Group for Enhanced Emergency Response—Mr. Clodfelter, Alice Wilson of the City of New Bern, and Sallie Vaughn of Person County. In addition, LGC is assisting TAC with the report on Smart Cities. LGC meets next on May 29.

State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC). Dianne Enright reported on behalf of John Farley, SGUC Chair. The committee continues to work on a new Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with Esri for GIS software for state agencies. She anticipates a two-year cycle to align with the State budget cycle, instead of the previous three-year cycle. The committee is also looking at a new limited services GIS contract through the NC Department of Information Technology, including evaluation of vendors that are bidding to be qualified. The next SGUC general meeting will take place on May 13.

GIS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Dan Madding, TAC Chair, reported progress on a 13-section Smart Cities document. He continues to work with volunteers for each section, with a group meeting scheduled for May 31.

Management and Operations Committee (M&O). Mr. Rankin reported that the committee met on April 1. Most of the information has been covered by other committees and presentations. The Working Group for Enhanced Emergency response, chaired by Hope Morgan, is active and the M&O Committee approved the charter for the working group. Also, David Giordano of CGIA gave the committee an update on NC OneMap 2.0 Standards and Practices document. The next M&O Committee meeting is scheduled for June 24.

2019 NC GIS Conference Recap

Mr. Johnson reported that the conference was held February 26 through March 1, 2019 in Winston-Salem at the newly renovated Benton Convention Center. There were 695 attendees, 57 participants in the Carolina URISA workshops, and 45 exhibit booths. The new three-day format featured 150 speakers organized in six concurrent sessions. The poster session had a record number of entrees—48. He explained that two weeks prior to the conference, only 20 poster slots had been filled. The GIS community rallied and put on an excellent display.

With a series of photos, Mr. Johnson highlighted the opening session that included remarks by Teresa Townsend, President of URISA International, and a moving presentation by Alice Wilson, City of New Bern, who described her experience applying GIS to response and recovery efforts related to Hurricane Florence. The exhibit hall worked well. Speakers covered a wide range of topics, and in sessions included a panel on PLS and GIS. Organized activities in the exhibit hall included a miniature golf competition, won by Jeff Webb from the City of Wilson. Mr. Johnson credited the many volunteers who made the conference a success, including Dianne Enright's food selections. The closing luncheon was an opportunity to recognize winners of the Herb Stout

Awards. The local government winners were the City of Asheville in the city/town category and Onslow County in the county category. Both jurisdictions produced innovative applications of GIS. Sixteen college and university students received the Herb Stout Award; students were selected by their respective college/university. Elon University participated in the process for the first time. All winners were congratulated by Mrs. Herb Stout.

GICC Member Announcements

Hope Morgan announced that LiDAR from Phase 5 in the far western region is available for download from NC Emergency Management. Large data requests require offline data transfer for which there is an online form.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:47 PM.

Dates and locations for Council meetings in 2019:

August 14, Albemarle Building, Department of Insurance

November 6, NC Emergency Operations Center

Presentations and reports for this [meeting](#) are on the Council [website](#).