



## North Carolina Geographic Information Coordinating Council

### Minutes

August 14, 2019

#### PRESENT

Alex Rankin (Chair), Paul Badr, Kathryn Clifton, Alice Wilson (for Jason Clodfelter), Bob Coats, Greg Cox, John Cox, Seth Dearmin, Stan Duncan, Dianne Enright, Joanne Halls, Pokey Harris, Jason Hedley, Matt Helms, Debbie Joyner, Bliss Kite, Sarah Koonts, Scott Lokken, Dan Madding, Elaine Marshall, Hope Morgan, Chris Nida, Yongjun Lei (for Allan Sandoval), Frank Scuiletti (for Wesley Beddard), Tony Simpson, Lee Worsley and Ron York

Staff: Tim Johnson, CGIA

#### ABSENT

Steve Averett, David Baker, John Correllus, John Farley, John Gillis, Chloe Gossage, and Dean Grantham

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

He introduced three visitors from the State of South Carolina who are interested in creating a resource like NC OneMap and wanted to observe a Council meeting to learn more about how it operates. The visitors were: Matt Wellslager, Chief of the South Carolina Geodetic Survey; Adam DeMars, South Carolina State GIS Coordinator and Program Manager for the Geographic Information Council; and David Morrison, Chief of the Wireless E911 Section and Program Manager for NextGen 911 Implementation.

Mr. Rankin asked Mr. Jeff Brown to join him to be recognized for his service to North Carolina. Mr. Brown recently retired after over 25 years of service in state government and served the Council and its committees as part of CGIA. Tim Johnson summarized Mr. Brown's accomplishments and

referred to him as the master collaborator. He successfully supported work such as the Clean Water Management Trust Fund, the Base Realignment and Closure effort along with the Sustainable Sandhills project, among other efforts.

For the Council and its committees, Mr. Brown was instrumental in the NC Parcels and Statewide Orthoimagery Program as those efforts moved from vision to reality. Mr. Johnson stated that Mr. Brown had been nominated for the Old North State Award which honors public service. The Governor's Office selected him based on the nomination. Mr. Rankin and Mr. Johnson presented the award to Mr. Brown. He expressed his thanks for the honor and referred to his position as one of the best GIS positions in North Carolina because it involved all the Council members and the broader community. He added that the GIS community practices collaboration in its everyday work. In recognizing the Council's visitors from South Carolina, he emphasized that persistence and patience are important in this work.

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 8, 2019 meeting were approved for adoption with no changes.

### Presentations

1. *Working Group for Enhanced Emergency Response (WGEER): Progress Report* (Hope Morgan, Working Group Chair)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Working-Group-for-Enhance-Emergency-Response-20190814.pdf>

Mr. Rankin recognized Ms. Hope Morgan to give an overview of the work of the group thus far. The WGEER was organized in December 2018 by the Council's Management and Operations Committee because after Hurricane Florence, significant number of agencies responded to the event who had not been asked to do so in the past. It was clear that a comprehensive overview of data at the state level was needed, who was responsible for it and what information needed to be compiled.

WGEER met starting in February 2019 and continued every two weeks to nail down the details leading to the recommendations presented today. The vision for this new effort is enhanced collaboration and avoiding duplication. Stakeholders need to understand the different layers, where they come from, and how they are produced, then decide who needs to make the data available. An example is flood inundation areas which have come from multiple sources.

Ms. Morgan presented two goals and associated recommendations for Council consideration. The first goal offered by WGEER is to develop capabilities to share information specifically for event response by clarifying business needs in state and local emergency operations centers (EOCs) that can benefit from geospatial data and technology. Ms. Morgan referenced the written summary report that WGEER prepared and is the basis for this presentation. It is available to GICC members.

One of the building blocks for moving forward is the State of North Carolina ArcGIS Online (AGOL) account. It will be used to create a portal specific to emergency response data.

WGEER specifically does not want to duplicate what is in NC OneMap or served by other agencies through their websites. Of equal importance is to make sure that the portal does not become a dumping ground for data. To that end, each contributing agency needs to identify its point of contact

and the set of information to be provided. Agency contacts can predefine data that has been used in the past and what will be allowed along with rules and requirements for adding data, including who could add it. Ms. Morgan referenced a FEMA template covering the timeline of information and how it is provided during an event.

When state and local agencies define what they can provide, each agency would have a page on the emergency response portal to make the data available. WGEER decided on the list of information that they thought should be available across all the agencies. The list is included as part of the written report. Federal agencies and utilities have their own AGOL portals and could just tie those to the North Carolina portal.

Ms. Morgan emphasized that during an event, data is created and includes data for planning purposes and should not to be shared further until vetted. A team needs to define rules on what is in the portal and rules and responsibilities for adding to the portal; otherwise it becomes unwieldy. It is important to define a database dictionary with a good file structure. Ms. Morgan referenced the NC OneMap guidelines/recommendations document that describes how data is stored and made available in AGOL. WGEER adopted this document.

Ms. Morgan asked for any questions about the first recommendation for creating the AGOL portal and the rules and guidelines behind it. WGEER is looking for concurrence from the Council. The Council did not have any questions at this juncture of the presentation.

The second goal centers around availability of staff resources to support emergency response for events such as Hurricane Florence. There are several agencies and local governments that have staff willing and able to assist during events. Willing individuals in government agencies could have been assigned during Hurricane Florence if there had been a process in place to allow it. With this in mind WGEER recommends creating a plan for activating people during events.

Ms. Morgan emphasized the need to create criteria for volunteers in the state. NCLGISA has been used by NC Division of Emergency Management (NCEM) in the past to identify volunteers for an event to support information technology needs and had been used for GIS volunteers as well. This was accomplished using the current NCEM process for state agency volunteers and the future GIS staff activation would need to be assigned via the same process.

Criteria available through the National Alliance for Public Safety GIS Foundation (NAPSG) can be applied to this goal. For each type of need, potential volunteers would need to have certain skills that are specific to each type of volunteer such as GIS technician and GIS supervisor.

Ms. Morgan referenced the National Incident Management System (NIMS) compliance framework which describes criteria for how an event works including chain of command and where different information falls. Eventually, GIS staff identified would be confirmed through this compliance process. It will provide an approval process to assure who is being sent to support an event is ready and capable to provide support.

Another component of this activity is providing details to the volunteer about the environment that he/she is entering for the volunteer to be ready to serve. A checklist is needed to convey that environment to those who are being deployed to support. NCEM prepares mission ready packages to deploy individuals who have been identified. Local governments could help by identifying what their

needs might be for an event. WGEER wants to have platforms that include cities and counties. There will be a role for them as well.

Ms. Morgan summarized by thanking the members of the working group and the work they accomplished very quickly. WGEER has started conversations with CGIA on AGOL and with NCEM on the systems for integrating volunteers. WGEER would like to submit these recommendations to the Council and asks for its support.

Council Chair Rankin asked for any other questions and then asked how far in advance of things data need to be populated through the portal. Ms. Morgan responded that a typical lead time is 96 hours prior to an event. Some data could be positioned well in advance such as NOAA imagery and flood maps with 100-year and 500-year zones. Mr. Rankin asked if there is a number of people that might be needed to support an event. Ms. Morgan stated that four teams of two people were deployed for Hurricane Florence for two weeks covering information technology and GIS needs.

Matt Helms asked where disaster recovery of data and infrastructure fits into this process. Greg Cox asked if there are any special buildings where GIS data could be stored in the event of a disaster. We need to make sure that data is taken care of in the event of a response need.

Dan Madding asked Ms. Morgan to describe how municipalities go through county governments to become involved through WebEOC. Cities would need to request through counties to submit for them.

Pokey Harris offered that there are other emergency incidents that are not weather-related that also could be supported such as ransomware situations and cyberattacks. Local staff can become overwhelmed and need support. The volunteers identified through the process described could support those activities as well. Ms. Morgan agreed and indicated that NCLGISA has been involved in that type of discussion.

Sarah Koonts asked about records management for data that goes into the portal as part of the event. Did the group build in governance plan for records management about how long it should stay and when it comes out? Ms. Morgan responded that the group emphasized metadata and the need to produce a basic, quick set. The group did not discuss how long the data would be retained. Normally, a formal, final set of data that was approved for an event is documented and temporary datasets are archived. Ms. Morgan indicated a willingness to look further at the needs for archival.

Joanne Halls asked if there was discussion about modeling data that goes into predicting an event. Ms. Morgan said that most of the data is modeling data.

Mr. Rankin asked the Council if WGEER is headed in the right direction. Council members concurred with the direction.

Greg Cox asked if the recommendations and work could broaden and should it be broadened. Ms. Morgan responded that the information presented was a starting point but that it could grow. WGEER views the document as a living one. Ms. Morgan sees future work in cooperation with NCLGISA on processes.

Mr. Helms asked about management of the portal. Ms. Morgan indicated that each agency contributing to the portal would be responsible for their organizational piece. Mr. Cox asked if there is value in making a copy of the information available to an outside group of people to experiment with and provide more ideas for WGEER. Ms. Morgan said that we need to get the basic structure completed first, but it is worth talking about.

After further comment, Mr. Rankin asked Ms. Morgan about the timeframe for finalizing a plan. She responded that AGOL could be created quickly, perhaps by the end of 2019 along with a data dictionary.

Mr. Rankin commended Ms. Morgan and WGEER for their work. The narrative version of the WGEER report will be provided to Council members by email.

2. *Working Group for PLS and GIS: Final Report* (Tim Johnson)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Working-Group-for-PLS-and-GIS-FINAL-REPORT-20190814.pdf>

To recap the work of this Working Group, Tim Johnson reminded the Council of its purpose which was to work with NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCBEES) to define GIS and the scope of engineering and surveying services in relation to GIS, review legislation governing PLS and GIS activities, and make recommendations to the Council. Mr. Johnson stated that the final step in the process is to communicate results to the broader community and we are ready to take that step.

Seven responses were received from the broader community subsequent to the May 8 GICC meeting. Those respondents reviewed a document that included the 22 use cases and a disclaimer. This document was shared in mid-May with the responses received in mid-June. The GICC Management and Operations Committee reviewed each of the seven comments with the following conclusions:

1. The purpose of data development is key – whether for inventory, legal determination, or as a basis for engineering/construction.
2. Local government data development for inventory purposes falls within GIS practice.
3. The government exemption covers both state and local government.
4. The Geospatial Body of Knowledge describing the breadth and depth of GIS practice should be added to the Use Cases document.
5. The purpose of data development matters in creating contours where interpolation and geospatial modeling in general can be GIS practice, depending on the purpose with risk if an engineer uses contour data but fails to read the disclaimer or uses the data for an unintended purpose.
6. Future consideration may be given to licensing GIS professionals, similar to licensing of photogrammetrists.
7. Members of the GIS community may pursue changes in the general statutes to address any fresh concerns.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the next steps include production of the final version of the Use Cases document based on some great comments from reviewers and includes a decision tree for evaluating when a PLS is needed. The disclaimer will also be finalized after today's meeting. All this information will be shared through the GICC website and listservs. The information will also be shared through formal communication with NCBEES from Council Chair Alex Rankin. As stated at the last Council meeting, NCBEES and the GICC agreed to meet annually to discuss any new issues that arise. Mr. Johnson concluded his report and there were no questions from Council members.

3. *Public Access to Infrastructure Data: Facilitated Discussion* (Alex Rankin, Tim Johnson)

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Public-Access-to-Infrastructure-Data-Discussion-20190814.pdf>

The Council has discussed previously that anecdotally after 9/11 a lot of utility data has been closely held. State agencies and private organizations have had challenges with preliminary or final design of utility projects because the data has been handled in that fashion. The Attorney General's Office (through Jessica Middlebrooks, DIT Legal Counsel assigned to the GICC) informed the Council of its responsibility to make GIS data available to taxpayers. The Council also knows that there are responsibilities for protecting secure data.

The GICC needs to talk about how it moves forward including business needs for access, relative importance of certain data, and potential impact of Executive Order 91 and the forthcoming "Dig Once" policy.

The Council learned at the May meeting that most jurisdictions do not have provide public access and it is often the case that GIS coordinators cannot obtain access to the data for their own jurisdictions. The perceived risk to the public has outweighed the value in easy access to users. The Council has learned that for private utility companies, access for an emergency response purpose may be granted but not for other times and purposes. Hope Morgan has communicated with WaterWARN, Duke Energy, and others about their policies and practices.

At the May Council meeting, Jessica Middlebrooks shared several general statute references about the responsibility for making GIS data available as well as federal law regarding protections for infrastructure in connection with the Homeland Security Act of 2002. However, there is no case law in North Carolina regarding the sharing or limiting access to infrastructure data. Ms. Middlebrooks advised the Council in May to think through its responsibilities for making data accessible to fulfill the mandated roles of the Council and CGIA.

Ms. Morgan commented that in her discussion with the WaterWARN groups, the need to access the data is something that they are currently dealing with. WaterWARN would welcome a recommendation or letter from the GICC requesting that there be a formal requirement or documentation for requesting the data and how it should be provided. Then, WaterWARN could respond to the letter. WaterWARN wants to have rules but a letter from the GICC would help them establish those rules.

Mr. Rankin received a written comment from Kristian Forslin of the North Carolina Railroad, advisory member on the Council, who could not attend today. Mr. Forslin stated that it is often difficult for his organization to obtain infrastructure data for the area in the vicinity and present on North Carolina Railroad right of way that they own.

The Council needs to discuss four questions today that help frame the issue and ultimately lead to next steps.

Question #1: What business needs require access to infrastructure data?

Mr. Rankin stated that any development project, public or private, needs information on location, size, and capacity. This is pertinent of locating hospitals, schools, or other construction. Paul Badr added that geophysical companies needs same information. Environmental consulting companies also

need the same information. Mr. Rankin also stated that this information is key to any economic development assessment in order to make early determination of whether a community has the necessary infrastructure to be considered.

Greg Cox conveyed a major proposed economic development project that involved investment in new infrastructure where greater knowledge of the entire system would have been helpful. Unfortunately, the data was not available except in small portions. Everyone in the economic development food chain needs access to the detailed data.

Mr. Badr added that the data is needed additionally for asset management and for emergency response.

Dan Madding asked Mr. Cox if he had difficulty in obtaining where water and sewer lines are located. Mr. Rankin added that a requester before 9/11 could obtain information on the entire system but since then access is either extremely limited or inaccessible. Mr. Cox confirmed that statement and that he could obtain as-built drawings which would be useful for engineering calculations. Mr. Badr added that subsurface utility work is an application where you need to locate what exists already for the new infrastructure to be located.

Mr. Johnson asked if there are other business needs represented at the table. Mr. Madding stated the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services receives inquiries from the waste-to-energy business community interested in location of substations to help estimate transmission for power generation.

Mr. Cox also believes that easement information is needed and that information is not readily accessible. For example, Duke Energy built Lake Norman in the Charlotte area and easements were established for future steam power plants. Presence of the easements limits/prevents development. Ron York of Duke Energy indicated that those easements are registered and were paid for by the company and can be searched for and located. Unfortunately, comprehensive information about easements is simply not available in one convenient place.

Both Mr. York and Matt Helms of Charlotte Water expressed difficulty in mapping their easements.

The North Carolina 811 (i.e., the “ask before you dig” group) is also mentioned as a business need related to Executive Order 91 and the forthcoming “Dig Once” policy.

Question #2: Which data layers are needed and why?

Paul Badr stated that all physical features on the ground are needed for a variety of purposes. Greg Cox believes that it needs to be infrastructure in general. Much is readily available. Mr. Johnson reflected on the statutory reference Jessica Middlebrooks shared which named infrastructure and its subcategories.

The following data layers were viewed as necessary in describing infrastructure data in North Carolina. The group recognized that some data already exists statewide and is readily accessible.

- Transportation infrastructure
  - Roads
  - Bridges

- Dams
- Underground utilities: water, sewer, electrical, gas, cable and telecom
- Cell towers

Mr. Cox also believes that future improvement plans such as the NCDOT Transportation Improvement Plan information need to be readily available.

Ms. Morgan stated that one of the issues is that the data is often available but in disparate locations. It is neither easily shareable nor usable.

Paul Badr believes that the level we are talking about for planning purposes is 1-inch =100 feet scale mapping and then 1 inch=50 feet scale mapping for engineering purposes.

Joanne Halls shared that there is a need for stormwater infrastructure in order to do emergency management planning and flood modeling in order to know where the water is flowing.

Mr. Johnson reflected that there were datasets in the 1990s with water and sewer lines represented but it changed to service areas after 9/11. The conclusion from the discussion is that lines are needed today as well as service area, depending on the purpose of the business need.

Secretary Marshall asked if some of the data really exists such as telecommunication lines. Information is filed in the Secretary of State's Office that has minimal value due to the quality of the submittals to her office. As-built drawings need to be registered and are needed to make this valuable.

Mr. Rankin stated that the data often exists, but we do not have access. Mr. Johnson added that Executive Order 91 and the "Dig Once" policy could help us.

Question #3: What is the impact of not having the data available?

Mr. Rankin started the discussion by sharing that he has heard repeatedly from Council members about lost opportunity due to lack of access to infrastructure data. It raises the cost of projects of all types. Kristian Forslin from the North Carolina Railroad has previously shared that they have problems performing economic development projects and it also affects his organization's ability to maintain rail infrastructure. John Farley has expressed that it slows progress on NCDOT projects and causes additional design work due to lack of information. Paul Badr added that the lack of access to infrastructure information also increases the risk on projects, such as damage to infrastructure due to lack of knowledge of its existence.

Greg Cox added that it facilitates cooperation to have information (such as infrastructure data) known by all parties touched by a proposed economic development project up front.

Ron York reminded the group that the Duke Energy power transmission data is relative, not precise, and that needs to be understood in the event this data becomes available. Dan Madding asked if it would be palatable for Duke Energy to provide a buffer to requesters. Mr. York stated that that was the way in which the company responds to North Carolina 811.

Question #4: Do we need full public access to the data, or can it be limited and still meet the need?

Paul Badr stated that it must be limited in today's environment. There will be a narrow channel of people who will have access to the level of data that we have been discussing. Alice Wilson shared



that the City of New Bern wanted to share all their information for companies who are supporting the city to have access to it.

Greg Cox stated that certain information needs to be safeguarded. We need to determine who should have access and for what reasons. Kat Clifton wondered whether there have been examples where information was not available for good actors in the construction industry that resulted in loss of life. Limited access to information currently but with safeguards in place for locating those that are site specific seems to work. Mr. Rankin stated that the process is not efficient. Mr. Cox describe the evolution of limiting access as a tree with two roots; one root grew over time as the data was created and made available, and technology then helped enable its availability beyond just the creator of the data and then the second root developed as a reaction to 9/11 where access to the information was completely prevented – not an overaction at the time but with the passage of 18 years, it is worth revisiting.

Hope Morgan offered that requiring a non-disclosure is one remedy for sharing infrastructure data while ensuring responsible use. Penalties for sharing beyond the limits of the non-disclosure would be significant. Individuals or groups needing access would be predefined whether it be for economic development or other purposes. Most companies are not necessarily against sharing their data, but they need assurance that the data will not end up in the wrong hands.

Mr. Rankin wrapped up the discussion and thanked the group for all their ideas and thoughts.

### Committee Reports

***Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC)***. Paul Badr, SMAC Chair, briefed the Council on activities of the committee since the May 8 Council meeting.

Prior to sharing status information about the committee, Mr. Badr described an RFP that has been issued by the Triangle J Council of Governments for photogrammetric services. He stated that given the scope of the work presented in the RFP, those services should be contracted based on the rules of the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCBEES). Mr. Badr reached out to NCBEES and was advised not to respond to the RFP. He also made the Council leadership aware of the situation. He reached out to Triangle J indicating that the scope of work in the RFP should follow a different process that does not ask for cost prior to submitting qualifications and was informed that they intended to continue with the RFP process. Given the rules that apply, Mr. Badr's company will not be responding to the RFP. Mr. Badr also shared that his understanding was that the plans for the project were shared with the Council and Tim Johnson.

Mr. Johnson responded that a representative from NC Next Generation Networks (NCNGN), the group working with Triangle J on this effort, met with him in the weeks prior to release of the RFP. NCNGN intends to supplement the four-year, statewide orthoimagery cycle by collecting fresh imagery in high-growth areas in between the four-year span. Mr. Johnson stated that he thought the project itself was worthwhile, but he advised NCNGN that qualifications-based selection (QBS) should be the method used and he provided them with a sample Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that had been used in the past by the statewide orthoimagery program. The conclusion was that the idea for the project was good, but the approach could have been handled differently. Mr. Badr concluded by stating that if submittals come in from other companies, those companies are probably breaking North Carolina rules.

Highlights of the July 17 meeting of the SMAC are summarized below.

- For the Statewide Orthoimagery Project, the 2019 project is well underway. All counties will be reviewed by September 20. Part of the most recent proposal to the 911 Board was to collect the 4<sup>th</sup> band (color-infrared or CIR) statewide. The board approved the expenditure. The data will aid in 911 response efforts, and possible statewide data creation for data such as land cover.
- Regarding parcel data, to support planning and possible mitigation, the parcels project team was able to convince counties to upload their parcel information to the cloud transformer in advance of Hurricane Florence.
- All LiDAR data is now available statewide, including phases 4 and 5. Statewide contours are being created with a goal of completing all counties by October.
- 2022 Reference Frame planning and coordination continues in advance of the horizontal and vertical datum changes coming in 2022.
- The NC Board on Geographic Names has had a change in leadership with Cam McNutt assuming role of Chair of this committee from Tim Johnson, who was acting on an interim basis. The NCBGN deliberated on eight name changes. The SMAC agreed with all the motions recommended by the NCBGN. The recommendations have been submitted to the US Board on Geographic Names.
- Concerning the Working Group for Land Cover, the work continues and in the absence of a state government agency ready to fund a large land cover classification project, the Working Group advises that SMAC look for opportunities related to a recent NOAA pilot project.
- For the Working Group for Municipal Boundaries, the group has come up with a solution to create a baseline municipal boundary dataset. The timetable for the remainder of this calendar year is to further develop, communicate, and promote the project.
- Regarding access to utility data, Hope Morgan and Jason Clodfelter looked at utility data access from state and local perspectives, respectively. Both found out that requests for the data are handled on a case-by-case basis and that, in most cases, there are no set rules and written policies are rare.

During the 2022 Reference Frame discussion, Mr. Badr called on Matt Wellslager of the South Carolina Geodetic Survey to share activities in his state. Mr. Wellslager described his state's outreach efforts to the user community with the message that the change will benefit the community.

The next meeting of the SMAC is on October 16.

***Local Government Committee (LGC).*** Alice Wilson reported for the Committee on behalf of Jason Clodfelter, LGC Chair. The LGC met on May 29 and will meet again in two weeks. It discussed Next Generation 911 and the roles of the NC 911 Board, the contractor GeoComm, CGIA, Public Safety Answering Points, and county and municipal GIS coordinators. Durham and Richmond are pilot counties getting attention this summer following workshops across the state in June. The committee concluded that local GIS managers should get on board early to learn and add value.

LGC members discussed the summary document issued by the Working Group for PLS and GIS and the group agreed to seek more comments from local governments. On the GICC topic of Public Access to Infrastructure Data, LGC discussed two schools of thought on data distribution. For example, in the City of New Bern, infrastructure data is now publicly available to support economic development and other uses, but other jurisdictions withhold the same data with concern for the risk

of harmful use. Committee members observed that there may be local government security measures that could allow access to trusted users.

Members of the LGC are active in working groups related to GICC priorities, including municipal boundaries, hydrography, and enhanced emergency response. The committee has been learning more about the 2022 Reference Frame as well. As Census 2020 approaches, LGC is monitoring developments for complete count commissions with coordination by Councils of Governments and new construction of housing. Also, some local governments are concerned about storm-displaced residents and Census 2020. The Census approach is to count people where they normally reside. Local governments need to document addresses and track information on damaged homes, homes with building permits for rehabilitation, and houses being demolished. There are still displaced people who need to be counted. Efforts now can be useful if a jurisdiction chooses to challenge the 2020 Census count.

The LGC will finalize its Work Plan for 2019-2020 at its next meeting in two weeks.

***State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC).*** Dianne Enright reported on behalf of John Farley, SGUC Chair. The committee has been focused on the wrapping up the ESRI Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) covering state government agencies. Some last-minute changes have slowed the process and nailing down what is/is not in the agreement. The expectation is to have the ELA in place by the end of this month. The SGUC is developing its work plan for the coming year and the committee will miss the contribution of Jeff Brown in that process.

The next SGUC general meeting is scheduled for August 22.

***Federal Interagency Committee (FIC).*** Scott Lokken, FIC Chair, shared the report of the committee and focused on the work of the NOAA-National Geodetic Survey (NGS) in the absence of new information from other federal agencies. Important activities for NGS include: (1) blueprint on how to work in the modernized, NSRS environment; (2) GPS on benchmarks for the new transformation tool; and (3) movement from the US survey foot to the international foot. Webinars are available on these topics.

***GIS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).*** Dan Madding, TAC Chair, reported on the latest activities of the committee. Efforts have been focused on developing the Smart Cities document. Two use cases are described in the document which is available from the GICC website. Mr. Madding thanked the committee members and others who contributed to the report.

***Management and Operations Committee (M&O).*** Alex Rankin reported as the committee chair. The M&O met on June 24 and focused on the topics that we have discussed on today's agenda. Updates were provided on Census 2020, statewide orthoimagery, parcels, and announcement of completion of Phase 5 LiDAR. The M&O also heard a report from each of the Council's standing committees.

### GICC Member Announcements

Pokey Harris, Council member and Executive Director of the NC 911 Board, shared the status of the Next Generation 911 (NG911) project that will enable geospatial call routing. She thanked Alice Wilson for her comments on NG911 as part of the LGC report. Four regional meetings have been held covering all Public Safety Answering Points and local government GIS contacts across

the state. The data upload is starting into the GeoComm Data Hub. GeoComm is the contractor focused on bringing standardized GIS data to ultimately create a statewide dataset for NG911.

Gerry Means, NG911 Project Manager for the NC 911 Board, gave additional details about the effort thus far, working with the jurisdictions to support the data upload effort. He thanked the CGIA team for its work and conveyed that GeoComm had been an excellent partner thus far. Richmond County will be the first county to move its data to NG911. Ms. Harris concluded by echoing thanks for the support provided by Matthew McLamb and Anna Verrill of CGIA.

Greg Cox suggested that Council leadership allocate 15-20 minutes at one or two meetings per year for Council members to get to know each other better. There would be a break midway through the Council agenda to encourage this interaction. This could enhance the Council's collaboration efforts even further. Mr. Rankin agreed to take the comment under advisement for future meetings.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:57 PM.

The final meeting of the Council will be November 6 at a location to be determined.

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