



North Carolina
Geographic Information Coordinating Council
Local Government Committee

NCGICC

MINUTES

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

February 26, 2020, 2:00PM

PROCEEDINGS

The quarterly meeting of the Local Government Committee (LGC), a committee of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC), was held on February 26, 2020.

PRESENT

LGC members:

Debbie Brannan, Cabarrus County, GICC (LGC Chair)
George Brown, Alexander County, NCLGISA
Robin Etheridge, Dare County, NCPMA
Aarti Sharma, Centralina COG, ACRED
Ben Strauss, Wake County, NCACC
Natalie Walton-Corbett, City of Greenville, NCLM
Alice Wilson, City of New Bern, NC-APA (LGC Vice-Chair)

Others:

Bob Coats, Governor's Census Liaison, NC Office of State Budget and Management
Dr. Michael Cline, State Demographer, NC Office of State Budget and Management
Crystal Burnett, Brunswick County
Marlena Isley, Alamance County, Hydrography Working Group
David Nash, City of Fayetteville, Working Group for Census Geospatial Data
Sallie Vaughn, Person County, Working Group for Enhance Emergency Response
Stephen Dew, Guilford County, Metadata Committee and Working Group for Orthoimagery and Elevation
Amanda Paton
Tim Johnson, CGIA, Director
David Giordano, CGIA, Staff to the GICC
Ben Shelton, CGIA, Project Manager
Anna Verrill, CGIA, Staff to the LGC

Absent members:

Pam Carver, Henderson County, CURISA representative

WELCOME

Debbie Brannan called the meeting to order and welcomed members and representatives.

MINUTES

Motions and voting for approval November 20th Meeting Minutes occurred.

MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Debbie announced the retirement of George Brown on May 1st. The LGC appreciates his participation on the committee and within the local GIS community in North Carolina.

DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY AND THE 2020 CENSUS

Debbie introduced Bob Coats to present on Differential Privacy and how that affects the data coming out of the 2020 Census. After the presentation Debbie will share information about a survey the GICC has asked the LGC to send out to solicit feedback on the topic and how census data is used in the local government communities. The feedback from the survey will be shared at the next GICC Management and Operations Committee.

Bob Coats gave the same presentation he and Mike Cline gave to the GICC on February 12th. This presentation is intended to give a foundation on Differential Privacy. The "Backgrounder" document on Differential Privacy provides more detail on this information. The 2020 Census is upon us. It is important because North Carolina is on track to get at least one more seat in the US House of Representatives which is the constitutional requirement for the Census. More important to local governments is the amount of funding that are directly tied to census counts. In Fiscal 2015, that was \$1, 623 per person, per year in federal funding tied to census counts. The State obligates about another \$200 per person, per year in funding based on the counts. So, the economic impact is about \$1800 to \$1900 per person back in Fiscal 2015. These numbers most probably have increased since then. In terms of local government usage, this is the most granular count or detailed picture of the population that we get every decade. The census count ends up being very foundational to how local governments and local businesses are analyzing their need and how they serve their community. It is a vital tool.

In terms of general census timelines, in two weeks from now, the week of March 12th, the Census Bureau will begin mailing questionnaires out. This will be an internet first response option. Folks can also use their phone or paper options will also be available. April 1st is Census Day. You do not need to wait until April 1st to respond, but this is the reference point. Whenever you receive your questionnaire, if this is where you'll reside on April 1st this is where you should be counted. State populations will be reported to the President on or by December 31, 2020. This is when we would find out if North Carolina gained another seat in Congress. The detailed redistricting files will be delivered in April 2021. This is when local governments would be able to see their official census counts. This is also when you can reach out to Bob and comment as to whether you believe these numbers are accurate. This also begins a two-year challenge period where local governments can issue challenges to the census count. These

challenges must be based on procedural issues and you must be able to document these concerns with your own research. If a subdivision was counted outside the city limits and this should have been inside the city limits, or if a group quarters wasn't counted, was located in the wrong place, or a whole subdivision didn't receive any census mailings these would be grounds for challenging the census count. The reasons for the challenge have to be documented. The challenge window will close in 2023. These challenges are free. When this challenge window closes the Census Bureau will redefine metropolitan statistical areas.

There are plenty of resources we can use as we go into crunch time to motivate all our friends, family, and coworkers to be counted. The [census.nc.gov](https://www.census.gov) website contains these resources. If you're active on social media use the hashtag #makeNCCount and @NCCensus to ensure all the work we are doing is elevated to make sure everyone in North Carolina gets counted.

Once the count is complete, and the point of the discussion today, is Differential Privacy. It is important to point out that the Census Bureau takes privacy very seriously. Over the past several decades there have always been measures in place to protect the confidentiality of your response. There has been data swapping, suppression, and other tools in place to ensure that nobody can identify based on census information an individual or individual household responses to the Census. However, the Census Bureau has recognized that computing power has increased dramatically recently, and the skill of hackers has also increased over the past decade. Therefore, the previous privacy measure may not be good enough to protect the privacy of individuals or individual households. Toward that end they have decided to implement a new strategy called Differential Privacy that will better protect confidentiality. The Census Bureau claims this will protect confidentiality forever. Basically, Differential Privacy has a privacy loss budget or epsilon that is the amount of noise that will be added to a data product or to data tables to decrease data accuracy, but to protect confidentiality. Data tables for small population groups or small geographies may not be produced because of this noise being introduced at least initially. They are not saying they will never release them, but they must determine how they can best implement this new policy to produce data that is reliable for small areas. They are not sure how to do this quite yet.

Generally, looking at the implementation of Differential Privacy it tends to move population from large population areas to areas of smaller population. There are some demonstration products that were released by the Census Bureau to show the impact of Differential Privacy as if it had been applied in the 2010 Census. You can compare the actual products released with the 2010 Census and compare with these demonstration products to see the actual impact. For the City of Raleigh for instance, Raleigh would have lost about 5,000 in population while smaller population areas like Red Bottermount Village ending up gaining a significant number in population. The plan right now is that Differential Privacy will be used in the 2020 Census. This is not for the apportionment figures that will be released in December 2020, but for the redistricting products that come out in April 2021 and for following products release Differential Privacy will be applied to those data. Differential Privacy will also be used in other census products like the American Community Survey (ACS). Currently, Differential Privacy will be applied to ACS data in 2025.

To highlight the impact on data products of Differential Privacy, Bob shared a table published by the Census Bureau. The apportionment products, redistricting file, demographic profiles, and the

demographic and housing characteristics file (this is a product that will replace the Summary Files 1 and 2 that local governments may be familiar with from the 2010 Census) all of these products are scheduled to be released with Differential Privacy applied to them. While the apportionment product and several of these products will have information on race and Hispanic origin the nature of Differential Privacy means that detailed information on some of those characteristics will not be available at least initially. While you will be able to find out the number of persons who are black or white or Asian, if you want to find out the number of people who are black and white and Asian that level of data may not be available initially. Also, if you are trying to find the number of people who are black and Hispanic, that level of detail may also not be available initially. Also finding the tribal designations you will be able to see the number of people who are Native American, but if you want to find the number of people who are Lumbee or Cherokee that level of specificity may not be available at least initially. Any table that requires complex personal and household joins (i.e., the number of persons per household or average household size) that information will probably not be available initially based on the issues of Differential Privacy. When we start looking at applying Differential Privacy to the American Community Survey, that's the per capita income and things like that, Differential Privacy is going to have an impact on how this is presented. Also, most importantly to those performing heavy duty data processing at the local level, the Public Use Microdata Sample file, the PUMS file, the Bureau is not sure how they are going to be able to release this with Differential Privacy.

Bob then shared some more detail of a spreadsheet released by the Census Bureau on their Differential Privacy website. The details convey how there are some data products where the Bureau is not sure how they will be able to release these initially. There are also some data products that they will not be able to release below a certain geographic level. For instance, when you are looking at the data for Hispanic or Latino by race these will only be released at the County level initially. They will not release this data at census block or tract level at least initially.

Bob also shared links to the demonstration products. The 2010 Census demonstration tables here: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/2020-census/planning-management/2020-census-data-products/2010-demonstration-data-products.html>. Also Esri used this data to create a dashboard to show the impact at the municipal or place level. The Esri dashboard can be found here: <https://arcgis-content.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/04451f90e7b049f39aa6647a41b986ac>. Bob then highlighted some of the communities that can be found in this dashboard. He shared that while he was presenting these next few slides to the GICC, the Census Bureau Differential Privacy staff were holding a meeting with Dr. Mike Cline's network of the federal-state cooperative for population estimates and they agreed that Differential Privacy could not be implemented in a way that it was with the demonstration products. The next couple of slides are using Differential Privacy as it was originally pitched, but the Census Bureau is reconsidering some of this. What we may see as a final product will probably not look like the information found in the 2010 demonstration products.

The Esri dashboard was then shared highlighting first the City of Greenville. The difference of the total population from the Summary File 1 in the 2010 Census was almost 79,000 people but using Differential Privacy the population would have been almost 78,000. This was a population loss of 978 people for Greenville, NC. That's a 1.2% population. That may seem like a huge number, but keep in mind the

economic impact of the census. Using the numbers provided earlier of \$1823 per person per year, this loss of 978 people, would be an economic loss of \$1.8 million in terms of federal and state funding. This is obviously a concern. Also shown are the age distributions. These look roughly similar from the summary file 1 as originally published and used with Differential Privacy.

Moving just to the west of Greenville to Farmville, their original population was approximately 4,500 people. With Differential Privacy their population increased by 182 persons. That's a 4% increase in total population. This would mean approximately a \$331,000 increase per year in federal and state funding. More importantly and of higher concern for Farmville are the impacts to the age distribution data. There is a lot more variability and a lot more noise in the estimates of the data as reported versus that with Differential Privacy applied. When the State Demographer, Dr. Mike Cline, does his population estimates and predictions baselines on the census this makes it more difficult for him to produce these baselines especially at the age levels that are usually very reliable. In this case, Differential Privacy adds a lot of noise to the data.

The Census Bureau is encouraging all the stakeholders to provide feedback on Differential Privacy. Many national organizations including the national partnerships that Bob Coats and Dr. Cline are a part of have already responded. They have engaged with letters to the Census Bureau and they hope to have more engagement with them over the new few weeks and months. Bob Coats and Dr. Cline did make a recommendation to the GICC that a response from that organization would be appropriate. In the meantime, they are encouraging state and local agencies to document their census data needs. Look at your normal business operations and determine what census data you are consuming on a regular basis, what do you need to conduct business and serve the people in your communities. Include with those data needs any legislation requiring that census data be used. This information can be forwarded to the 2020 Census data product development team. This is what Anna and the team from this community will talk about next, the survey or inventory that will be distributed. If you would like your individual voice to be heard, that is certainly appropriate as well. Individual email feedback should be directed to: dcmd.2010.demonstration.data.products@census.gov. We do encourage everyone to speak up. While we do believe the decision on Differential Privacy is a done deal and we are a little late to the game, there may still be room for engagement on how Differential Privacy can be implemented in a way that provides good data quality at the geographic level that we need.

In summary, Differential Privacy will impact data quality with noise and the number of products that will be available at the small geographic levels that a lot of local planners will need. As you are doing your inventory keep those two main components in mind. There may be more information to talk about and there is the Backgrounder document to reference as well, but you can also reach out to Bob Coats and Dr. Mike Cline directly.

Alice mentioned the presentation Bob Coats gave to the North Carolina APA (American Planning Association) and they were going to send a letter as well. Bob followed up that there have been a lot of formal responses and letter writing campaigns from a lot of larger national organizations. The State of Virginia has also sent a response. There will also be a recommendation from the GICC sent as well. More feedback is encouraged. Even if the GICC sends a letter in for the State of North Carolina, individual trade organizations, local governments, and individual citizens should make their voice heard.

Debbie Brannan concluded the discussion by asking for any other comments or questions and thanked Bob for his time and giving the presentation. Debbie then asked Anna Verrill to share information on the Census Data Survey being developed. Anna explained Debbie and herself have been working on a survey to send out through listservs. We are still awaiting final sign-off before sending out. This is a series of 10 questions many of which are multiple choice and allows you to select more than one answer per question. The questions ask what type of census data you used in your current day-to-day work, the scale in which you used the data whether that's at the County level, municipal or census blocks as well as other related questions. We are hoping to send out the survey through the listservs by the end of this week. Anna requested that if anyone has anyone in mind that we should target to let her know.

Tim mentioned the alternative to this survey is having the local government community consider how you use the census data from 2010 and at what geographic scale and provide a paragraph on here is how we used it and here is how Differential Privacy as you understand might affect that use. Trying to get as many responses as we can get but at least a dozen local government examples that we can share as we are doing the same thing with the State government user community. We could either do the survey or take this different approach. Tim is interested to know which method may be more effective at gathering this type of information that will be ultimately sent to the Census Bureau as examples through this letter that the Chair of the GICC is likely to send.

Natalie from the City of Greenville feels like the survey will be most beneficial because she for instance would not be the one to need to fill this out but could forward this onto the person that should for the City. Sending the survey with the option of writing up a paragraph at the end of the survey may be effective, but getting a paragraph written up may not be quite as easy as we would want it to be.

Mike Cline suggests that perhaps just selecting representative examples of small government and large government and asking those folks to look at it. It is such a complex issue to try to explain and he's worried the survey may not be as useful, unless the intention is just to inventory how people use census data. The survey itself does just inventory data use. He wondered if we go to the next step and select representative people to give some examples based on their jurisdiction size since whatever may happen to a community of one size may be very similar to another community of the same size. Crystal agrees and thinks it's a great idea. Mike mentioned the challenge is figuring out what those categories should be and who we should contact for those.

Bob we are not necessarily asking you to focus on what you ask of the Census Bureau but to focus on your actual data needs. If you're looking for population or community information or income information, really what you need are those related data. Look at your data needs and then determine if that is coming from the Census Bureau. Then we can look at whether this information will be impacted by this policy change.

Alice then shared that New Bern has a large area that they are doing a redevelopment commission in and information especially for a town as small as they are is very vital. They want to make sure they get this right because they will be stuck with these decisions for 10 years. We want to make sure we help the people in that area as best they can, but they must have accurate information as a base.

Debbie asked for any other comments or suggestions. Debbie again thanked Bob Coats for the presentation. It's a complicated issue and is hard to think about trying to make decisions based on data that is not accurate. It may be that we have to adjust and operate from a new baseline and new normal. Alice also wanted to add that in thinking about the coronavirus and if we are challenged as a community and the virus spreads and they are trying to understand where people are located, especially those that are vulnerable, it is going to be important to have accurate information so we can provide help and send our limited resources to the right place. This may be another good example if we can get someone from the health and safety arena to voice their opinion as well.

There were no other comments or questions mentioned on the 2020 Census Differential Privacy topic.

OTHER GICC TOPICS

Debbie introduced this next agenda item for topics relating to this committee from the February 12th GICC meeting.

2022 Reference Frame and US Survey Foot Topics

The 2022 Reference Frame and US Survey Foot topics were presented on. The SMAC will be looking to give the Council recommendations in April. Debbie asked for any comments the LGC would like to provide to the SMAC members on the call.

Tim added that these 2022 Reference Frame and US Survey Foot are separate topics. The 2022 Reference Frame was voted on by the Council and approved on February 12th, 2020. The next step with this is for the Council to send a letter to the National Geodetic Survey coordinating with Gary Thompson from the NC Geodetic Survey to show that the Council is on record as being in favor of adopting the 2022 Reference Frame. The US Survey Foot is the topic still needing to be decided upon determining if we are going to adopt the international survey foot or keep the US Survey Foot. This is going to the SMAC during their April meeting for an extended discussion. Then this will be brought back to the Council with a final recommendation where the Council could weigh in favor either for or against changing from the US Survey Foot to the International Foot. The message for the Local government Committee members especially those that serve on the SMAC is they need to come prepared to give their opinion at the next SMAC meeting based on the information Gary Thompson has presented to the Council. The information shared by Gary Thompson can be found on the [last Council meetings event webpage](#).

Debbie asked for any additional discussion and none was received.

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

Debbie also shared there was a discussion on UAVs. Her biggest take away from this presentation was the remote ID that is going to be required in the future for drones which will make all existing drones obsolete. Before anyone invests in a new drone, investigate whether this has remote ID.

Geospatial Maturity Assessment

Debbie than asked Tim to share information on the next topic the Geospatial Maturity Assessment. Debbie mentioned she thinks the grade we received is a reflection of the collaboration between the State and local governments.

Tim began by mentioning that receiving North Carolina's report card which is reflective of all the work the local government community and all the work CGIA has done in collaboration over the years and that it is nice to share this information with everyone on the call today. The Geospatial Maturity Assessment was conducted by the National States Geographic Information Council also referred to as NSGIC. NSGIC is the state's GIS Coordinators from around the country and Tim represents North Carolina on this council.

NSGIC wanted to get a picture as a nation as to where we stood with respect to coordination efforts and with respect to framework datasets. They established criteria for grading things A through F for each of the states in each of those areas. The idea is to identify gaps where states are not doing so well, where other states may be doing very well and be able to share with each other best practices and eventually get at funding issues that need to be supported across the country.

The criteria included coordination which asks questions through a survey. Questions like "Is the coordination effort in your state legislated?" or "Is it staffed?". For each category there were approximately 6-10 questions. It was very extensive. It was completed last Summer/Fall. Jeff Brown and Tim completed this for the State of North Carolina, reaching out to the right people within the state to ensure we gave the best answers. The Assessment was made public in December 2019 and is available on the NSGIC website at: <https://www.nsgic.org/>. It is a 122-page report of mostly tables and maps.

For North Carolina, the overall grade is a B+. There were no A's given. We received a grade of B+ for coordination. Related to this, the thing we took a hit on was the strategic planning process. Some states have very structured and formal strategic planning processes whereas we do this more through the Council as a coordinated effort and discussion rather than a paying a contractor to write a strategic plan. For the themes starting with addresses, we received a B. We have done work over the years collectively on addresses. Probably the latest generation of addresses will be what is coming out of Next Generation 911, but as of today the most current dataset we have for addresses is from 2014. The next dataset is parcels. Not too surprising, parcels received a A+. This is one of North Carolina's shining stars. The next dataset is the elevation data, this is the Lidar data. This is another shining star and received an A-. For geodetic control, North Carolina has one of the best geodetic control networks in the country. Geodetic Control received an A+. For governmental units we got a B. This is one where we still need to do some work with municipal boundaries. Hydrography was next. This also received a B. The baseline in North Carolina is 1:24000 scale for rivers and streams and we have been trying to improve this. When we get to a higher resolution dataset we will move toward the A-range. Orthoimagery was divided into two pieces. One was leaf-off orthoimagery. We received an A in this category with all the work we've done collectively as a state over the past decade to create this to a standard and repeatedly through the support of the 911 Board and with all of you in reviewing that data within the process. There were only a few states that got A's in this category. The other orthoimagery category is leaf-on orthoimagery which is basically the NAIP photography. This is more important to the western states than the eastern

states. We received a B on this. Finally, there is transportation and the network throughout North Carolina and how that's represented while it doesn't do everything it met all the criteria the evaluators were looking for, so this received an A+. Across the board we received nothing lower than a B, with several As. We collectively were represented very well.

Forty-one out of the fifty states participated in the assessment. We are in the top 5 or 6 in the country in terms of our efforts to both coordinate the use of GIS and deliver on this for our citizens. Tim encourages everyone to read the report especially if you are curious as to what the questions were and what constitutes an A for a dataset.

Debbie thanked Tim for sharing this information. She mentioned that from a county's perspective it's hard to get municipal boundaries sorted out, so this must be hard to get statewide. Debbie asked that when this effort for municipal boundaries begins at the statewide level to keep her informed so Cabarrus County can be part of this as well.

Alice chimed in thanking Tim for sharing this information and for his leadership. He has led us as a state to get where we are at. Jeff and Tim especially have been there all along the way and Alice appreciates this and she knows others do as well. Tim attributed the success to all of us including the local governments.

Debbie concluded by mentioning that when we discuss LGC outreach a little later in the call that this could be a topic we share to let everyone know how we did. It takes everyone working together to get to this point and it takes a great leader too. Debbie thanked Tim.

NEXT GENERATION 911 UPDATE

Debbie passed the meeting over to Anna who provided the update for the Next Generation 911 project.

For the GIS portion of the Next Generation 911 project, we have 127 PSAPs in North Carolina and 101 of these have been onboarded. This also includes either one-on-one meetings, attending workshops, or participating in the training virtually. Eleven PSAPs have reach the "i3-readiness" status, meaning that their GIS data has passed the required standards, their match-rate between their ALI database and road centerlines is 98%, all the required datasets have been uploaded, and there are no critical errors being reported. All this information is reported through GeoComm's GIS Data Hub.

The 911 Board, CGIA, and GeoComm are continuing outreach efforts including regional workshops and one-on-one meetings. We also have begun discussions in collaboration with our neighboring states beginning with Virginia. A few of the joint counties between North Carolina and Virginia met at a workshop in early March. We are hoping to continue these efforts across the borders all around North Carolina.

Some of the more common issues that we have seen are agencies will upload their road centerlines, but not their ALI table. The boundary data may also be excluded which includes their provisioning boundary, PSAP boundary, and the fire, law, and EMS boundaries. It is important to upload the centerlines, ALI,

and boundary data as soon as possible. GIS staff within the counties are needing to communicate with their 911 staff to ensure the boundaries are correct. Similarly, GIS and 911 staff need to communicate with their neighboring counties GIS and 911 staff to ensure the boundaries between each other are aligned correctly and are agreed upon.

All agencies going live from now through the end of the project will need their GIS data to be i3 ready prior to the PSAP ESInet migration. If you have any questions related to the Next Generation 911 GIS process, please feel free to reach out either to Anna or Matt McLamb at CGIA. Questions may include but are not limited to the following: when is my ESInet go-live date; when does my data need to be ready to support that date; how do I submit my GIS data; or is there anyone to help interpret the error report. We are available for conference calls and site visits if needed.

We appreciate the support and interaction with everyone thus far. The success that we have had would not have been possible without the input and collaboration without each county and municipality. Thank you.

UPDATE ON LGC OUTREACH

Debbie moved onto the next topic regarding update on LGC outreach. In reviewing the by-laws of the GICC LGC, there is three objectives, two of which are relevant to this topic. The first is to establish a forum for organizations that represent local government GIS users and geospatial data producers in North Carolina to share knowledge and ideas about GIS policies, geospatial data, technology, applications, and related information. The second is to inform local government users of geographic information about the status of GIS activities in the state and the actions of the Council. To help accomplish these two objectives we have been meeting to discuss more LGC outreach.

Since our last meeting, there have been two meetings comprised of a smaller LGC outreach planning team. Debbie appreciates everyone who has participated on this. Originally the planning team talked about doing a something in the spring and in the fall. We found that for the date we chose in the spring there were already some other GIS activities going on at the same time. The outreach team has discussed tagging onto those activities in terms of announcements and information sharing.

We have decided to host a Fall 2020 information sharing session in New Bern. Debbie then asked Alice if she would like to share the plans that she's been working on there. Alice reached out to the Craven County Community College. They have three areas on campus that we could utilize that could hold anywhere from 50 to well over 100 people. They all have audio-visual capabilities. The use of this would be free. We're looking at mid-August to mid-September. With school starting in late August we may want to look into hosting this before than or maybe in early September. We are still trying to figure out an exact date. This most likely would be held on a Friday.

Debbie has also met with the Board of NCLGISA and asked for a GIS track at the NCLGISA conference in the fall. Debbie also requested to have this recurring on even years. Debbie understands others have mentioned going to a NCLGISA conference and as GIS practitioners they really didn't find enough related content. Both Alice and Debbie have discussed this with their Esri representatives, and they feel like

they have enough support to give a GIS track at the next NCLGISA conference at least on the even years when the NCGIS conference is not taking place. This would give local government GIS professionals additional opportunity to attend a governmental conference on the even years. We will be looking to get that GIS track filled for the Fall NCLGISA Symposium which is from October 20-23rd in Asheville, NC.

We will be reaching out to this group for ideas on what we would like to see related to local government GIS and for the collaboration of what is needed for the data side and policies and procedures from the state and local government collaboration. There is a lot of opportunity for us to reach out. In terms of GIS, there's a lot of technology support that goes into GIS as well. They will also be looking into adding sessions regarding IT support in relation to GIS.

We have also discussed starting a social media channel. If we had a site where people could post to and established a hashtag like #gicclgc to communicate on, this might establish a forum for more information to be shared about what is going on between the state and local government in GIS. Debbie asked the group for comments on this. Anna mentioned that she will look into feasibility of doing social media through the State of North Carolina's Department of Information Technology. She will share whatever is discovered as that happens. Debbie added that even if we don't end up with a specific channel, we could still have people start post things if we come up with a specific hashtag. If we could generate some interest around this, we could start getting messages out. Instead of a formal meeting, all the members of the committee can post about things that are going on in their communities. Tim chimed in and mentioned the Local Government Committee could blaze the trail here as the Council has not taken up social media as a communication path. Debbie has researched hashtags to see what is out there for GIS and of course Esri has put a lot out there in terms of social media, but she also saw that NC OneMap also has a presence. Natalie added that you may want to work for your PIO Officer if you got someone doing an official handle for your county or local government or city government as they are always looking for content. If you post from a personal account, that would be a good route to go to team up with.

Debbie invited any other comments for outreach. She also mentioned that another outreach planning team meeting will be scheduled to discuss this more. The team welcomes any and all participation. If you have any younger people or your PIOs that would like to join to discuss the possibility of social media, just let us know.

BEST PRACTICES FOR PROVIDING ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Debbie then announced that the Council's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is looking for volunteers to serve on the TAC to help provide information for the Best Practices for Providing Public Access to Public Infrastructure Data document they are compiling. Debbie added that if we could find members from local government that are actually involved with infrastructure, in the public works or utilities area, the GIS users who are actually the owners of the data it would be great for them to be on this committee. These public works/utilities professionals are the ones that may have the biggest concerns about security. If we could get those voices on the committee, they could maybe help with quell any security issues. This would go a long way. Debbie then asked if there were any volunteers to help the TAC get the best practices document established.

Tim added that Dean Grantham has been asked to chair the TAC. Dean is with the Department of Environmental Quality and is a council member. We also are going to be reaching out to others. It is critical to have good representation from the local government committee and any people you know that could really impact the issue. The TAC works a little different than some of the user committees in that it is very fluid and dependent on the issue. We want to get subject matter experts to weigh in and participate for the duration of the discussion of that issue. They are not permanent members of the committee, but they provide significant value to what the committee is trying to accomplish. This topic is a heavy-duty issue that we are considering here because we are trying to get more types of this data out in the open for more people to use. We do want to hear all the different perspectives. Between now and the May 6th Council meeting, Dean will be asked to get the committee together and have an initial session about some of the issues around this topic. This will ultimately lead to the best practices document.

Alice mentioned the APWA NC group that looks at using GIS in public works. Alice believes Andrew Shore from the City of Burlington may be the contact for this group. Alice wondered if we should reach out to them to see if they can recommend anyone. Tim mentioned that among the Council members Matt Helms from Charlotte Water and Stan Duncan who is a former local government tax assessor will participate in the group; we will have good technical as well as policy representation. Tim added that he thinks the group Alice mentioned is a great suggestion.

If someone wants to volunteer or have suggestions, they can reach out to either Tim or Anna.

BRIEF UPDATES FROM COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

Debbie moved into the next topic, the updates from committees and working groups.

Working Group for Enhanced Emergency Response

Alice began by mentioned her and Sallie have reached out to Hope Morgan because the working group hasn't met since the last September. The next meeting is scheduled for the middle of March 2020. They have been working with Esri to look at ways that they can setup a type of portal so they can share and receive data using ArcGIS Online. They have been testing this site. Other than that, there is not much to report at this time.

Working Group for Seamless Parcels

As Pam Carver was not present during the meeting, Anna provided the parcels update. First quarter 2020 updates are underway throughout the state. Thirty-three counties have been published so far. Outreach is occurring to the remaining counties this week to try to get more Q1 updates in. We are also reviewing the schema for compliance. We are interested in potentially creating required, recommended, or option fields. This discussion is currently ongoing between John Bridgers, Pam Carver, and Anna. This may be brought back to the working group to provide feedback on as well as a few other groups we may need to run this by. We have an initial list and conversations to weigh in on this may be coming up.

Working Group for Orthoimagery and Elevation

Ben Shelton with CGIA provided the update for the Working Group for Orthoimagery and Elevation. During the last meeting in January, they primarily covered the current project in the orthoimagery program cycle. The 2020 project is currently underway. This is the first phase of the new four-year cycle covering the 27 counties along the coast. As of today, they are roughly at 80% collected. They expect to complete this coming weekend with good weather forecasted. It has been a rough acquisition season with all the rain and bad weather and with warm weather the leaf-out conditions start coming up. Once things are collected, they will move onto the processing phase of the project. Ben will be reaching out to the contacts in those 27 coastal counties in the next month or two to start setting up the process for participating in the quality control application. Quality Control will begin in July and last through October.

They anticipate expediting deliveries, again they are shortening their timelines and gaining some efficiencies, and they are expecting to deliver in November 2020. This is earlier than any project they have done in the past. Also, for the first time, they will be including the fourth-band of imagery. Along with the normal three-band RGB, they will be doing the color infrared imagery. This will be part of the deliverable. They are formulating those deliverables and what they will consist of and they think there will be a couple different products. The full four-band TIFF files, but also three-band false color alongside the three-band true color. They are trying to provide everything someone may need. The four-band product will also be distributed through NC OneMap like usual.

The color infrared is a topic the working group discussed. They are starting to look at updating the white paper. Back in 2011, the working group created a white paper detailing some of the uses of color infrared as well as the technical background. The working group is interested in having the LGC participate in the editing of this document. If there are use cases that you can think of that you want to use color infrared for, it would be good to get these included into this new version of the white paper. Any kind of documented uses really helps promote the continuation of collecting and creating this product across the state. Once the working group reviews this document, they will send this out to the Local Government Committee for input. They are interested in seeing how end-users like yourselves would use the product.

Next the working group discussed the Lidar update which is also happening along the coast. This update encompasses about 16,000 square miles along the coast. They are collecting QL1 quality data. That's 8 points per meter. This is being done by the USGS in coordination with NOAA. As of December 18th, they were 95% collected. If anyone is interested in that product, let the working group know and they can get you in touch with contacts as USGS who can share where that data is being distributed.

The 2022 reference system was already covered earlier in this meeting, but this was also covered at the last working group meeting. The working group also discussed Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS). The Department of Public Safety (DPS) is creating a database of UAS assets around the state that can be deployed in case of a disaster. If anyone on the call is interested as being listed as one of those assets, Ben can provide you a link on the DPS website where you can register. You can also contact Gary

Thompson. Related to this, they are also coming up with some damage assessment training exercises. This would allow them to test that database would work if they need to deploy assets around different counties to test the capabilities. There is also a test site in Butner in Granville County for validating systems if you are interested. If you have a UAS you want to calibrate to make sure it is collecting correctly, able to use ground control, and everything else that is necessary to investigate. This is an excellent resource that is run by the State. Gary Thompson is the contact for this as well. He can provide you access to this property.

Other than this they are revising their approach with the Orthoimagery and Elevation Working Group to work better together with this group, the LGC. They will be revising their agenda to reserve time to hear feedback and input from this group and the members of this group who are part of the Working Group. It will also serve to get your input on the presentations they are doing, if there are products the working group can pay attention to more closely or work on that would benefit your work, and anything else that may be relevant.

Hydrography Working Group

Marlena Isley gave the update for the Hydrography Working Group. The last meeting they had was in November of 2019, they are still waiting for the 2020 meeting dates to be scheduled. The last thing they discussed was the data coming out of ATLAS which is considered the single-most authoritative dataset and has been a long process so far and it continues to be. There are several agencies involved and each one has their own needs and priorities that they are considering. These include USGS, DWR, NCDOT, and local governments. The current version, 1.2, is available through DOT if you have an NCID.

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee

Alice mentioned she'll do her best to not repeat any topics already discussed since there is a lot of overlap. Alice thanked Ben for all the hard work with the Imagery Project and that she is looking forward to seeing the results. Alice mentioned she noticed Esri has incorporated the imagery into their services so if you zoom into more than 60,000 scale you can see the statewide imagery. Ben chimed in that this was a good point and Esri is working on incorporating the 2019 imagery now.

Gary Thompson had mentioned sending some information regarding color infrared to the LGC so they could provide comment. It is possible they may be able to work with FEMA to determine if color infrared can be used for disaster recovery purposes.

For contours, 94 counties should be completed soon. New building footprints are being updated and they are adding new attributes to buildings regarding floodplains. Twenty-eight counties were completed in June 2019. You can go to flood.nc.gov and if you click on the mapping tab you can see the status of your county.

Census 2020

David Nash provided a couple of updates on the 2020 Census more at the worker bee level. For whoever is appointed at your jurisdiction to turn in the boundary annexation surveys, it is very important they try to get this completed by March 1. Anything turned in by this time, will be included in the 2020 Census. The boundary validation program is also going on right now and is close to final. Someone in your city or county should have received information about this program. If you haven't already done so, you need to make sure you destroy any confidential information you were given during the LUCA program.

Within the City of Fayetteville and within Cumberland County, they have been asked to provide their own list of group quarters. The Census Bureau already has the group quarters listed at the State's demographer's office, but they are thinking there may be smaller ones that are missed that can be found on these local lists. The Census Bureau wants to make sure everyone living in those quarters get counted.

The Complete Count Committees are probably up and running in most areas now. Lots of outreach efforts is being organized by those groups. These are designed to get a really good complete and accurate count. Some interesting maps have been created and made available to committees showing the hard to reach communities in your local area. This may help in targeting your outreach efforts.

The 2020 Census is getting ready to happen soon. The Census Bureau will be mailing out invitations to households soon. There is an interesting video on how to fill out a form. One of the things mentioned, is when you get this invitation it will have a number on it. This number is important, do not throw this away because when you go online to fill out your form you will need to have this number. However, if you lose the number or invitation you can still respond online, you'll just be in a different group of people that have lost their number.

On March 12th, the Census Bureau website will go live. There will be two other ways to respond either by telephone or by filling out an actual paper form. These are just some of the things that are happening and hopefully by the next time we meet this will all be over with.

David concluded with a final comment on Bob Coats earlier presentation on Different Privacy being used in the 2020 Census. David wondered about some of the information on race may be interfered with to try to protect confidentiality which seems to collide with the idea redistricting efforts that are needing to be happen with this new data which are traditionally released at the block level. Usually this was extremely accurate, and he can't imagine they are going to introduce errors into this. That would then seem to complicate the redistricting efforts and potentially the lawsuits that may happen because of this. Alice mentioned that by law the redistricting data must be accurate, what is not going to be is the things that come after this. Like the detailed block level data that has median income and number of people per household, this kind of information will be distorted. David hopes pressure can be mounted to bring them back from doing this.

OTHER ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Debbie opened it up to the group to discuss other issues and concerns.

Alice asked if anyone does have a preference the timing of the New Bern workshop. If anyone preferred August, or September. With no one providing feedback Debbie gave permission to the host to choose what date works best for them.

Debbie mentioned the terms of the LGC membership that are due up end of June. Anna mentioned that half the members are expiring at the end of June and we will want to begin filling those vacancies for July soon. They will aim for announcing the new members at the May LGC meeting.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Esri Southeast User Conference is in Atlanta from April 28-29, 2020.

NCLGISA is hosting a workshop on chatbots and PowerShell programming and on March 19th in Goldsboro.

The NCLGISA Spring Symposium is in Wilmington, NC from March 20-22, 2020. The Fall Symposium will be in Asheville, NC from October 20-23, 2020.

Tim provided an update on the 2021 North Carolina GIS Conference. There is a request for proposals out for the City of Raleigh and the City of Winston-Salem. They will be choosing between those two cities for the conference. They are looking at dates that could range from February through April. The registration rates have not been established because the location needs to be known first. The goal is to keep it under \$250 as a full registration. This cost was discussed with the LGC a couple years ago and that seemed like a reasonable price point. One of the important things Tim would like to ask all on the call or those that we know to consider serving on the Program Committee. Tim wants to ensure the program is very reflective of the community which means it should involve the entire stakeholder community in North Carolina. It is a good bit of work starting first thing in April and runs through October. They want to make sure they have a great program and that requires a great program committee to create that program. Matthew McLamb and Tim Johnson will be running the Program Committee. Think about it, consider it strongly and reach out to Tim if you want to get involved.

ADJOURN

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.

LGC's web page on the GICC website: <http://it.nc.gov/gicc-local-government-committee-lgc>.