



North Carolina Geographic Information Coordinating Council

Minutes

February 12, 2020

PRESENT

Alex Rankin (Chair), Steve Averett, Paul Badr, Frank Scuiletti (for Wesley Beddard), Debbie Brannan, Kathryn Clifton, Bob Coats, John Correllus, Greg Cox, John Cox, Seth Dearmin, Stan Duncan, Dianne Enright, John Farley, Kristian Forslin, Joanne Halls, Gerry Means (for Pokey Harris), Matt Helms, Debbie Joyner, Bliss Kite, Camille Tyndall Watson (for Sarah Koonts), Scott Lokken, Dan Madding, Rich Elkins (for Elaine Marshall), Hope Morgan, Chris Nida, and Ron York

Staff: Tim Johnson, CGIA

ABSENT

David Baker, John Gillis, Chloe Gossage, Dean Grantham, Jason Hedley, Allan Sandoval, Tony Simpson, 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, Council Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed Council members and visitors. There were no announcements and the Chair moved to the next agenda item.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the November 6, 2019 meeting were approved for adoption with no changes.

Presentations

1. *Making NC Count, Differential Privacy – Bob Coats, Governor’s Census Liaison, Office of State Budget and Management*

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Differential-Privacy-20200212.pdf>

Mr. Rankin reminded the Council of this important topic that first came to the GICC Management and Operations Committee at its December 2019 meeting. He called on Mr. Bob Coats to present the information today. The 2020 Census is coming later this spring and means approximately \$1,800-1,900 per person per year for North Carolina in combined federal and state funding driven by the census count. The count is the baseline for population estimates and projections for the next decade. Response is “internet first” but not internet only with total population counts required to be on the President’s desk by December 31 of this year. Mr. Coats encouraged everyone to complete the census to assist North Carolina to achieve a complete count.

Confidentiality of census data is critical to the process with severe penalties for sharing it per protections in Title 13 of the US Code. There has been recognition by the Census Bureau that the landscape has changed in recent years with the strength of computers and the sophistication of hackers to access databases and other records. The method that has been identified to protect data confidentiality is “differential privacy”. The Census Bureau has always taken some steps to protect data, but this new effort takes the protection to a new level. For the 2020 Census data, a privacy loss budget (or noise) is being introduced into data tables and/or products. For example, information for race will be available but if you want to know the number of people who are African American and of Hispanic origin, that data may not be available, at least initially. Small population areas tend to gain population and large areas tend to lose population through application of differential privacy. Mike Cline, State Demographer, prepared a summary document that was shared with the Council by email back in December.

The decision to move to differential privacy has been made by the Census Bureau. It will not be applied to the counts coming out this December (i.e., counts used for apportionment), but it will be applied to all subsequent products starting in April 2021 such as Economic Census, County Business Patterns, Survey of Business Owners, and others. Demographic and Housing Characteristics File (formerly Summary Files 1 and 2) will have differential privacy applied when those products are released in 2021. Other tables that include detailed race and Hispanic origin information will also have it applied. Mr. Coats offered that the Census Bureau is meeting about this issue as he speaks so more may be known about Census Bureau plans as time goes on. Further, he stated that some data will not be released below the county level which does not give enough geographic specificity for some users and uses.

Then, Mr. Coats shared some links to Census Bureau resources (see GICC presentation) and regarding impact, he provided a couple of examples specific to North Carolina. Applying differential privacy to the 2010 Census data, the City of Greenville decreased by 978 people which translates to a funding decrease. The City of Farmville population increased by 182 people. The noise represented through the differential privacy direction will affect what we receive in 2021 and will impact the data analysis that we perform for our agencies.

Mr. Coats summarized by sharing some of the reaction thus far beyond his office. Certain national partnership groups expressed their concerns to the Census Bureau in November 2019 but did not receive a response as of January 27. As a result, the same three partnerships sent a letter to the Census Bureau recommending that the issue be tabled until after the 2020 Census collection when the issue of differential privacy could be better vetted. There has not been a response to that letter.

Concern continues to grow with respect to data quality and data availability and it would be appropriate for the Council to voice its concerns. The Census Bureau data products team wants to know what data is needed by state and local government agencies required to do their daily business. It is particularly important to know if legislation or rules require you to use census data. After April 1, this could become a bigger conversation and extend nationally.

Mr. Coats concluded by asking for questions from Council members. Mr. Cline added that they are really in need of where specific decision points at either the state or local level require the data in order to accomplish tasks such as calculation of a rate, for example. Greg Cox asked how long ago differential privacy has been used. Mr. Coats stated that going back to the 1920s or 1930s, privacy controls or disclosure avoidance techniques have been used but this will be the first census where differential privacy will be used. The Census Bureau claims to be on the cutting edge of this and only Google and Microsoft are using it. Mr. Rankin interjected that neither of those companies are using the data at the local level to make decisions on expenditure of public money. John Farley asked Mr. Coats to confirm that the state would receive the same amount of money regardless of whether differential privacy was applied or not, but it could be apportioned differently because of the noise introduced. He stated that differential privacy would be applied to the redistricting data released in April 2021. He added that differential privacy could be applied to county population totals such that they might not add up to the state total or census tract totals might not add up to the county total. Those are some of the issues in examining this closely. Mr. Cline added that the counts could impact calculation of birth rates, distribution of sales tax, and in other areas.

Mr. Coats added that his office has had communications with the Governor's Office about the issue. He added that a recommendation from the Council would be welcomed along those lines. Mr. Rankin asked for additional questions and comments. Rich Elkins voiced the strong opinion that introducing incorrect data and reducing the quality of the data was of great concern, particularly after state and local governments have been very responsive to the Census Bureau in recent years in providing the best available data – addresses, boundaries – as inputs to the Bureau's processes. It reduces confidence in the data and in the Census Bureau. Council members agreed that it should weigh in officially to the Census Bureau and Governor Cooper about this issue. Hope Morgan offered that the Council should at least recommend that the Census Bureau delay the decision until we can assess the impact.

Council Chair Rankin asked the chairs of the State Government GIS Users Committee and the Local Government Committee to assemble comments from their respective stakeholders prior to the next GICC Management and Operations Committee meeting (March 16). A motion was made and approved for the Council Chair and CGIA Director to assemble information and respond to the Census Bureau, Governor Cooper, and the Council. Mr. Coats offered to share the letters that have already been written as the Council begins the process of preparing the its response.

Tim Johnson offered that other states such as Arizona and its equivalent of the GICC are tracking this issue. There will likely be letters from other states to the Census Bureau expressing concern about the issue.

Mr. Rankin thanked Mr. Coats and Mr. Cline for their work on the differential privacy matter.

2. *Pros and Cons of Survey Foot Versus International Foot – Gary Thompson, NC Geodetic Survey*

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-US-Foot-20200212.pdf>

Council Chair Rankin recognized Gary Thompson to share information about the Survey Foot versus the International Foot and what it means to the geospatial community. The goal will be for the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC) to consider the information shared today at its next meeting (April 15) and make a recommendation to the Council for a vote at its May 6 meeting.

The National Geodetic Survey (NGS) has determined that it would be a good time to retire the US Survey Foot in favor of the International Foot as the country begins migration to the 2020 reference frame (i.e., horizontal and vertical datums) and a new state plane coordinate system. A Federal Register Notice was issued on October 17, 2019 to announce this intent. In North Carolina, the general statutes specifically refer to the US Survey Foot as part of the conversion process from feet to meters. The difference between the two representations is small when dealing with small numbers but is impactful when dealing with numbers such as state plane coordinates. Error could be introduced on a project if all involved are not using the same representation of a foot; an example is a road construction project where various contractors such as engineering firms, surveying firms, and construction contractors are involved.

Following adoption by NGS, any product from the federal government will be represented using the International Foot. NGS will support the transition from the current US Survey Foot. Some of the history on making this change dates to a Federal Register Notice in 1959 when NGS was directed to convert from the US Survey Foot at the next adjustment of the geodetic network. When the next adjustment occurred taking the network from North American Datum 1927 (NAD27) to NAD83, NGS did not take the step toward the International Foot. Subsequent proposals attempted to make the US Survey Foot permanent and make metric units the standard, respectively. Neither proposal was successful.

In North Carolina, General Statute Chapter 102 – Official Survey Base, §102.1.1, US Survey Foot is named as the standard. A decision must be made this year because the 2021 General Assembly long session will be the time when statutory language regarding the datum will change and the current US Survey Foot could be changed in the statute then as well. Most of the states currently have US Survey Foot in their statutes. One scenario is to use anything created under the NAD83-2011, NAD83-86, or NAD27 versions of the datum with US Survey Foot and then move to the International Foot when the 2022 datum changes.

There is no consensus among the professional organizations closest to the issue favoring either US Survey Foot or International Foot. Mr. Thompson referenced a webinar available from the NGS website with the rationale for making the change to International Foot for Council members who are interested. Gary requested the Council's opinion on this matter.

Mr. Johnson asked if there was a consistent reason why the states shown in blue on the map decided to go to the International Foot. Mr. Thompson stated that when states were given the opportunity to move to the International Foot back in 1988, they elected to make the change. South Carolina is an example of that decision. He further stated that metadata is going to be important if North Carolina moves to the International Foot as users exchange data that may have been created in either US Survey Foot or International Foot. Education of users will be important. Greg Cox asked if

professionals working in both North and South Carolina are seeing any issues since each state has a different statute. Mr. Thompson responded that there have not been issues. Hope Morgan asked if there had been conversations with the surrounding states. Mr. Thompson has not heard from those states. Dan Madding asked if the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCBEES) has voiced an opinion. Mr. Thompson indicated that they may not give an opinion because it does not affect laws and rules of the state. In addition, the statute referenced earlier is the NC Geodetic Survey's statute. NCBEES will probably follow suit with the opinion of the Council and then just educate the engineering and surveying professionals on what they need to do. Scott Lokken stated that NGS will move forward to create the 2022 datum and state plane coordinate system referenced in the International Foot, but North Carolina could do something different. Ms. Morgan added that all products generated through federal grants must be produced to federal standards which would mean the International Foot as the representation.

Mr. Thompson asked for the Council's direction at its last meeting of the year (November 4). Local governments and others represented on the Council need to provide opinions. Paul Badr asked what happens after the Council provides its opinion. Mr. Rankin responded that the Council would provide its opinion to Mr. Thompson and he could provide that to NGS. Mr. Johnson added that, concerning the statutory change, the Council is an advisory body that could support the NC Geodetic Survey in the statutory change it proposes.

Council Chair Rankin concluded the agenda item by thanking Mr. Thompson for his presentation and asked that any comments be provided to Mr. Thompson and Mr. Badr, SMAC Chair. The SMAC needs to come back to the Council at its next meeting with a recommendation.

3. *Unmanned Aerial Systems (UASs): Current and Future Uses, Regulations and Evolution – Nik Zisk and Jaimie Nevins, NC Department of Transportation*
See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-UAS-NCDOT-20200212.pdf>

Council Chair Rankin called on Ms. Jaimie Nevins and Mr. Nik Zisk to provide the latest information on the important topic of UASs. Nik started the presentation with a reminder of the licensing required to operate a UAS in North Carolina including a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 107 license and a permit from the State of North Carolina. NCDOT is one of only 10 participants in the Integrated Pilot Program (IPP) implementing drone programs and emerging technology with specific attention to the viability of actions such as drone delivery in an urban environment. Mr. Zisk shared a video of drone-based food delivery in Iceland; this kind of task is planned for the United States by the end of 2020. An example of its use will be performed in Holly Springs, NC by summer 2020.

UAS rule changes are coming in 2020 and Remote ID is an important aspect of these changes. Remote ID is the ability of a UAS in flight to provide identification information that can be received by other parties using the same airspace. The goal is to enable safe, routine drone operations across the nation. There are four types of Remote ID proposed (see slide [presentation](#) for details). Mr. Zisk further explained through a visual description of the three ways of remote identification: (1) standard remote identification drone; (2) limited remote identification drone; and (3) FAA-recognized identification area (FRIA). The standard remote identification represents commercial and government operators and those allowed to operate beyond visual line of sight. The second category requires visual line of sight and the FRIA category only allows an operator to fly in a designated area and includes those with drones that do not have a Remote ID capability.

Some of the concerns with Remote ID include loss of privacy since the Remote ID is broadcast over a network; cost of the subscription; and cost and availability of Internet service in certain parts of the country. These issues will be worked out over the next three years when the rules take effect. All drones must be factory manufactured drones with Remote ID built in. Current drones cannot be retrofitted. Mr. Badr asked if this rule makes current drones obsolete. Mr. Zisk stated that it does, but the belief is that drone technology will advance like cell phones and old ones become obsolete after a period of time. Mr. Badr stated that the difference is that investments have been made in earlier generation drones that are very substantial such as a \$250,000 investment. Mr. Zisk acknowledged that the FAA is receiving push back about this rule for reasons such as what Mr. Badr described. DJI offers a drone with Remote ID but it is a Chinese firm which has raised national security concerns. Currently, no American company manufactures a fully American-made drone.

Mr. Zisk shared a proposed rule that calls for certification of UAS as a special class of aircraft. It will give drones the same safety and regulations as commercial airliners and privately piloted aircraft. This is in anticipation of air taxi service that will begin in the next three to five years. Mr. Zisk further elaborated on the concept of UAS Traffic Management (UTM), its associated architecture, and the concept of operations in this coming type of environment.

Mr. Zisk concluded his presentation by describing the role of NCDOT in working with UAS and supporting operations such as emergency response. He elaborated on Esri software related to drone use and shared two final videos on drone operations in North Carolina including delivery at WakeMed and Governor Cooper's appearance at the recent transportation symposium with discussion about air taxi service. He shared links associated with the topics in his presentation.

Mr. Rankin asked for any remaining questions. Matt Helms asked if the Remote ID will still require a pilot. Mr. Zisk stated that a pilot needs to ensure that the drone does what it is supposed to do. There are software tools available today that allow you to fully program the drone without pilot intervention.

Council Chair Rankin thanked Mr. Zisk for his presentation and the information shared in this rapidly changing area of technology.

4. *Geospatial Maturity Assessment: Results for North Carolina – Tim Johnson, CGIA*

See <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/GICC-Geospatial-Maturity-Assessment-Results-for-NC-20200212.pdf>

Council Chair Rankin called on Tim Johnson to share the results of the Geospatial Maturity Assessment (GMA) prepared by the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC). NSGIC is the organization of state GIS coordinators across the country. Mr. Johnson introduced the topic by stating that this is a national look at how each state is maturing in its use of GIS. The goal is to look at gaps and needs across the states and identify opportunities for improving. Furthermore, it can be used as a guide to facilitate collaboration and learning from state to state. The GMA provides a baseline for future evaluation of progress. The GMA involved an extensive survey with over 100 questions and was conducted in the summer and fall of 2019. Results will be used in part to support implementation of the Geospatial Data Act of 2018 that was passed by Congress. The [2019 NSGIC Geospatial Maturity Assessment report](#) includes the full set of results.

The survey components consisted of questions about each state's coordination structure itself and an individual look at nine data themes: addresses, cadastre (i.e., parcel boundaries), elevation, geodetic

control, governmental units, hydrography, leaf-off orthoimagery, leaf-on orthoimagery, and transportation. Mr. Johnson shared a series of maps depicting the grades for coordination and for the nine themes. The grading scale was A through F with a total of 41 states participating in the survey. South Carolina did not complete the survey because their coordination efforts are still ramping up. Mr. Johnson commented on each grade for each of the survey components:

- Coordination (Grade: B+): recognizes the breadth of representation and history of the GICC and the fact that it is supported statutorily and is staffed and funded on an ongoing basis
- Addresses (Grade: B): overall, a solid grade but will be higher with implementation of NextGen 911; nationally, this is a data theme that needs investment
- Cadastre (Grade: A+): North Carolina is a model for other states in this area with full ongoing participation from all 100 counties.
- Elevation (Grade: A-): another success story based on investments that have been made over many years and with a sustained funding and programmatic commitment; another case where North Carolina has been a leader; the pace is picking up across the country to develop this data theme
- Geodetic Control (Grade: A+): North Carolina is a model here as well with investments that have been made over the years; for the country, the picture is also brighter with no D or F grades
- Governmental Units (Grade: B): an area where we know that additional work is needed such as municipal boundaries; questions for this theme were driven primarily by what is needed for the Census Bureau
- Hydrography (Grade: B): solid grade for North Carolina based on the 1:24,000-scale data statewide; states doing more than that baseline product received higher grades
- Orthoimagery, Leaf-Off (Grade: A): North Carolina is a leader in this area with investments made in the past decade; states with A+ grades fly every year or every 2-3 years; the “N/A” grades are in recognition of a lack of deciduous tree cover in western states and minimal need for a leaf-off product except in urban areas
- Orthoimagery, Leaf-On (Grade: B): results are based on the US Department of Agriculture NAIP program; solid grade for North Carolina with higher grades going to states that had more formal buy-up programs; the national picture looks good for this theme as well
- Transportation (Grade: A+): North Carolina recognized as a leader on this theme

Mr. Johnson stated that North Carolina received a grade of B+ overall, like several other states. No state received an overall A grade. However, he believed that North Carolina deserved at least an A-overall with its strong A grades and fewer B grades for the individual themes. North Carolina is in the top tier of states based on his conversations with the GMA authors. Mr. Johnson summarized by stating that some of next steps are exploring needs and gaps, sharing best practices, and learning from other states. Esri is working with NSGIC on a dashboard that will visually show the grades and other information contained in the report.

Mr. Johnson concluded his presentation by thanking everyone who has worked hard toward what is represented in the report.

Committee Reports

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC). Paul Badr, SMAC Chair, briefed the Council on activities of the committee since the November 6 Council meeting.

The SMAC held its last quarterly meeting on January 29. The primary points are summarized below:

- For the Statewide Orthoimagery Program, regional delivery meetings were held December 2-4 in the Southern Piedmont and Mountains project area flown last year to hand-off final imagery to PSAPs. The 2019 imagery is live on NC OneMap through web services and tile and county mosaic downloads. The project team is working with Esri to add the data to the Esri World Imagery Base Map. The 2020 project is already underway for 27 coastal counties. Imagery acquisition started in January and will run through March. Final delivery will take place in November 2020. Nadir imagery will be produced for the cities of Greenville and Wilmington, as well as 18 major bridges in the project area. Flyovers are being coordinated with six military installations in the area. For the first time since the inception of the orthoimagery project in 2010, the fourth band will be collected, providing color infrared data.
- For NC Parcels, all 100 counties were updated in 2019. First quarter 2020 updates are underway, although some counties will not have an update since their parcel data is updated only twice a year. Twenty-nine counties have been updated so far. Individual outreach to the remaining counties will begin this month.
- Progress on the elevation framework data continues and all LiDAR data has been collected for the state. The Department of Public Safety building footprints dataset will be updated using the LiDAR data. Only a handful of counties have not had contour lines created. This work continues.
- The 2022 Reference Frame was discussed at the SMAC meeting. The SMAC approved the recommendation from the 2022 Reference Frame Working Group and the NC Geodetic Survey concerning the 2022 NC State Plane Coordinate System. A handout explaining this was attached to the email meeting invitation.

Mr. Badr called on Gary Thompson to share more information about the 2022 Reference Frame recommendation. All states are required to develop new state plane coordinate systems. Mr. Thompson presented maps showing the existing state plane system and then the recommended change. The National Geodetic Survey provided several options for North Carolina to choose from as the basis for the new system. The NC Geodetic Survey chose the system with one standard parallel; the existing system has two standard parallels. It is a more topographically fitted state plane coordinate system which has less distortion. Then, a second decision was either to make the coordinates close to the current ones or make them much larger. The decision was made to make the change in coordinates from NAD83 (2011) and NAD2022 dramatically larger. Visually, the change will be obvious. A new false northing of 200,000 meters (currently 0 meters) and a false easting on 1,000,000 meters (currently 2,000,000 feet) will be put in place. The change will impact the parcel identification numbers in the county land records management systems. A translator has been created to help the counties as they transition toward 2022. Mr. Badr asked for the Council's adoption of the recommendation. Mr. Rankin asked for discussion and for any comment that Rich Elkins of the Secretary of State, Land Records Management Program would like to make. Mr. Elkins stated that his office has been aware of this possible change for some time and is supportive of it. He said that there is assistance available to help counties make the transition based on their situations and needs.

Council Chair Rankin asked for vote of the Council. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the SMAC recommendation.

Local Government Committee (LGC). Mr. Rankin recognized Debbie Brannan to report on committee activities since the last meeting. The committee met in November and one of the topics was public access to infrastructure data. The LGC believes that best practices and guidelines are needed to allay some fears about sharing the data and possibly convince those that produce it to share it. The committee received the latest information on the NextGen 911 effort and discussed and approved its work plan. The LGC recognizes that one of its ongoing responsibilities is to host information sessions and plans to do that on even numbered years when the NC GIS Conference does not occur. The purpose would be to better communicate about state resources, the value of those resources, and to inform local governments about this Council's initiatives. An ad hoc committee was created to brainstorm idea. The LGC wants to thank George Brown from Alexander County for his service to county government and to the GIS community. Mr. Brown is retiring and represents North Carolina Local Government Information Systems Association (NCLGISA) on the LGC. Ms. Brannan will be looking to NCLGISA to name a replacement. The LGC completed its list of FY2018-19 accomplishments that are tied to objectives in the work plan. The LGC is seeking new communication channels for connecting with local governments.

State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC). John Farley, SGUC Chair, briefed the Council. The SGUC finished its work plan by adding the access to infrastructure topic to plans for the current fiscal year. Esri briefed the SGUC on artificial intelligence and related topics at a recent meeting. The SGUC is reviewing the GIS services contract for any needed changes. The committee is beginning to work on a state government training program to help maximize the use of credits on the Esri ELA. A survey of state government agencies is forthcoming.

Federal Interagency Committee (FIC). Scott Lokken, FIC Chair, shared that the committee had completed its work plan and had assembled its set of accomplishments for the past year. The next general meeting of the FIC is April 14 with another general meeting planned for the fall. Federal representatives are being asked to make federal datasets available and have also been tasked with identifying grant opportunities that may applicable for the North Carolina GIS community. Tim Johnson asked the FIC to learn more about a new project that FEMA is conducting under contract to Oak Ridge National Laboratory to collect building footprints/structure outlines nationwide. Some questions include: (1) how does this data compare to North Carolina's dataset; (2) will it be accessible to the North Carolina user community; and (3) will it be maintained.

GIS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Dan Madding, TAC Chair, reported for the committee. Mr. Madding stated that the TAC plans to work on a best practices document for sharing infrastructure data. Some of the key questions are what can be shared, what should not be shared, and how to share it. He called for volunteers to serve on this topic area, perhaps those who have experience in this area. Council Chair Rankin recognized the service of Dan Madding as chair of the TAC for several years. Mr. Madding is stepping down and Dean Grantham, Council member representing the NC Department of Environmental Quality, has agreed to become the new chair; unfortunately, Mr. Grantham was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Rankin is adding Stan Duncan, Kristian Forslin, and Amy Barron (Duke Energy) to support this effort. [Editorial note: Matt Helms was added to this group as well.]

Management and Operations Committee (M&O). Alex Rankin reported as the committee chair. The M&O met on December 16 and discussed several topics that have been covered today including progress on NC Parcels, US Survey Foot and International Foot issue, 2020 Census and differential privacy, and LiDAR. Hope Morgan has been working with Esri and their LiDAR specialists; Esri intends to create dynamic service that uses the data and she will keep the Council informed of its availability. The M&O also discussed the public access to infrastructure data topic.

GICC Member Announcements

Gerry Means, NextGen 911 project director, reported on progress of that effort since the Council last met in November. There are 101 of 127 PSAPs that have accessed the GeoComm GIS Data Hub which is a starting point for assembling statewide data. Eleven PSAPs have met the NENA standard: Yancey, Mitchell, McDowell, Alexander, Randolph, Richmond, Raleigh-Wake, Sampson, Pasquotank, Camden, and Currituck. Raleigh-Wake and Richmond are using geospatial routing for call delivery at this point. Outreach efforts are continuing with regional meetings as well as one-on-one efforts. The team presented at the NC Property Mappers Association conference and shared information about the program. North Carolina is reaching out to its border states with the first call held in January with Virginia. Other states around the country have expressed interest in learning more about North Carolina's approach. Thirty-five PSAPs are currently on the ESInet with many more to come this year. Mr. Means encouraged the counties to make sure that their GIS leads are engaged in the process. The goal is to complete the GIS effort in June 2021.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the Chair requested and received a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 PM.

The Council quarterly meeting schedule for the remainder of 2020 is: May 6, August 12, and November 4.

Presentations given at this [meeting](#) are on the Council [website](#).