

# Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

1:00 PM, Thursday, May 6, 2004

Main Auditorium, Nebraska Department of Roads

## Minutes

### Roll Call Present were (authorized to vote \*):

Alan Beierman	*	Nebraska Public Power District
Jim Brown	*	State Surveyor
Lash Chaffin	*	League of Nebraska Municipalities
Steve Cobb		State Surveyors Office
Ray Fox		USGS
Dick Genrich	*	Nebraska Department of Roads
Rex Gittins	*	Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Les Howard		Conservation and Survey Division - UNL
Mark Kuzila	*	Conservation and Survey Division - UNL
Jim Langtry		Lancaster County Engineers Office
Scott McIntyre	*	City of Omaha
Kim Menke	*	Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
John Miyoshi	*	Lower Platte North NRD
Sudhir Ponnapan	*	Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
Steve Schafer	*	Nebraska CIO
Duane Stott	*	Scottsbluff County Surveyor
Paul Yamamoto	*	Department of Environmental Quality
Cliff Welsh	*	NACO - Keith County Commissioner
Larry Worrell	*	NACO – Lancaster County Surveyor
Larry Zink		GIS Steering Committee Coordinator

### Complete Meeting Agenda

### MAJOR MEETING TOPICS

Geospatial Data Center and National Map Update  
Street Centerline/Address Database  
Election of Officers  
I-Team  
Agency Reports

Future of Nebraska DOQs  
Land Records Modernization  
Enterprise GIS Coordination  
GIS/LIS Association  
Voting Record

**ROLL CALL:** Vice Chair Duane Stott called the meeting to order and requested a roll of members present. Ten duly authorized members were present and therefore the Steering Committee had a quorum of its members present and could conduct business.

**NOTICE OF MEETING:** Duane noted that a public notice of the meeting, pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R. S. 1943, was published in the Lincoln Journal Star on April 29<sup>th</sup>.

**INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FROM ATTENDEES:** Duane announced the open period available for public comment from those non-members attending the meeting. No comments were offered from non-members.

**APPROVAL OF 2/26/04 MINUTES:** Lash Chaffin moved approval of the minutes of the 2/26/04 GIS

Steering Committee meeting, as distributed. John Miyoshi seconded the motion. The motion carried.

### **NEBRASKA GEOSPATIAL DATA CENTER AND NATIONAL MAP UPDATE:**

State Records Board Grant. Kim Menke, NDNR reported that NDNR applied for a statewide grant of \$25,000 and received it. The funds will be used primarily to develop a front-end for our NE Geospatial Data Center for metadata so other agencies can start entering metadata. There will be a couple of ways to enter it, the FGDC format (existing metadata will be submitted to a parser and if compliant with FGDC metadata standards, it would come to NDNR for listing in the clearinghouse) and, second, a password protected area much like ESRI, which would have an online form for entering metadata. The fields included in this online form would only be a subset of the complete FGDC metadata (metadata-lite), but they would allow for the data to be listed in the clearinghouse and for online searches to occur. So, NDNR now has the idea of what we want to do and now just have to implement it.

Rex Gittins, NDNR, noted that the grant actually covered contract programming support as well equipment and software to support that individual. Right now, we are talking about negotiating with one person that we know has the skill sets and hopefully that will work out. Rex also indicated that NDNR will be looking to Larry for further input.

UNL Metadata Intern. Larry Zink, noted that Les Howard has worked with Mark Kuzila to get funding for an intern to work on metadata.

Les Howard, CSD, noted that there were not many applicants for this position. He reported that CSD is now in the process of trying to find someone and they will coordinate with NDNR or any other agencies interested. Les said he envisioned that this person will work very closely with at least one representative from the agency.

Larry indicated that if we get this person on-board, we will need agency cooperation in order to facilitate their work with the various agencies to help document existing geospatial data. Within the last month, Larry noted that he encountered two new staff people who moved into agencies where there they had GIS but no metadata. These new staff members indicated that they often can not use existing data, because it is not documented and therefore they must redevelop the data. While documenting with metadata is not an enjoyable task, it is a necessary one.

Les was asked what was the expected duration for this metadata support position that CSD is creating? Les indicated that initially it was being set up for a part-time person, 20 hours a week, for one year. We will have to see how funds go.

Larry also reported that Andy Bishop, US Fish & Wildlife, Kearney, indicated the possibility of some sort of coordination with this metadata effort.

Other Grant Opportunities - USGS Partnership Fund and FGDC Cooperative Agreement Program. Larry also reported that there were at least a couple other grant opportunities that he is working with NDNR to pursue in support of the Geospatial Data Center and related initiatives.

One is through the USGS Partnership Fund, which is a new effort this year focusing on the National Map. Larry reported that he has been working with DNR and DOR on this application. An application was submitted, on behalf of DNR, at end of last month. The application was to acquire copies of the Farm Service Agency DOQ's, acquire some hardware/software to allow DNR to store and serve that data, and to work with Department of Roads to further develop a street address centerline file. Larry noted that he had worked with many of the Str. Cmte. to solicit financial contributions in the purchasing of the DOQ's. Though he didn't have the money in hand, he reported that he was able to get enough commitments from various agencies to purchase the FSA DOQs. Larry indicated that the grant has been submitted to USGS and assuming it comes through, we will move forward on both of those fronts. However, Larry also noted that the interagency commitments were sufficient for the FSA imagery, such that even if the USGS grant were not funded, we would move forward with acquiring the imagery. However, because these imagery files are so large files (full-color, 1-meter), NDNR will need extra capacity to store and serve the data.

Another grant opportunity is coming up through the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP). This year this program has a category for National Map. The applications are due June 1<sup>st</sup>, so he indicated there will be more meetings in the near future about how we best utilize that grant opportunity.

Ray Fox, USGS, noted that he needs to write a letter of recommendation for any proposals that go in for the FGDC National Map, Category 6, so we should e-mail proposals to Ray.

Larry noted that in all of these grant applications the frame of reference for the applications has been to go back to that recommendation by the advisory committee that recommended we develop a geospatial data center at DNR and the Strategic Plan.

Larry indicated that the budget submitted as part of USGS Partnership Fund Grant Application included partner agencies' financial contributions to project of \$42,000 of the \$44,000 needed for FSA imagery. However the total partner agencies' contributions offered for FSA image acquisition as of 5/3/04 is up to \$61,000. Larry indicated that we need to talk with folks on how best to divide up the offered financial support.

Larry noted that the last time the Str. Cmte. talked about this issue there was a question about whether it made sense to buy the full non-compressed DOQs for \$44,000 versus a series of countywide compressed CDs at \$5,000 for the whole state. The working group decided to pursue funding support for acquiring the original, non-compressed CDs. The thinking behind this decision was that many folks were interested in having this imagery available for downloading from the web, as NDNR as done with previous statewide DOQs. To accomplish this with the compressed countywide CDs, it would first be necessary to decompress and re-segment the imagery so that it was no longer in huge countywide files. Also, the data is in UTM projection and many state and local agencies want the data in State Planes projection. The re-projection process will be a very computer intensive process and it is estimated that the re-projection process will take about 3 months of a computer working in the background. It is a large-scale effort since each color (three total) has to be re-projected separately. This re-projection process can be more easily automated, if we have the original non-compressed imagery.

Larry indicated that the major challenge now is to figure out how bureaucratically, accounting-wise, we can actually get this money in some pooled fund to actually make the purchase.

#### **FUTURE NEBRASKA DOQS – A REQUEST FOR A PARTNERSHIP - USDA FARM SERVICES AGENCY**

Larry reported that the issue of an ongoing partnership with FSA for statewide imagery is still undecided. He noted that he has first focused on getting copies of the 2003 FSA imagery. Larry noted that it was his intent to try to convene a working group to look at this issue in the next month or two, after he had completed the interagency effort to purchase copies of the 2003 FSA imagery. Larry reported that there was a discussion about this at the I-Team meeting on Wednesday. There was an considerable amount of interest in having 1-meter imagery updates every 5 years and NDOR would be interested in having a copy of 2-meter imagery for identify new roads about every other year or so. Larry reported that he did not find too many other people who felt they needed updates more often than the 5-year cycle. Larry asked if anyone has a sense of needing more frequent imagery updates, to please let him know. There was some concern, particularly in municipal areas, about the leaf on aspect of the FSA imagery. One alternative for municipality imagery in the future might be partnerships with NPPD, since they would not be doing leaf on imagery.

Larry indicated that the question seemed to basically be, does it make sense for us as an entity to wait and assume FSA will develop imagery updates and we can just come up with \$45,000 to buy copies, or do we want to do some kind of partnership arrangement with them? Two of the biggest advantages of partnership with them are encouraging them to keep developing the imagery and we gaining access to data much more quickly. At this point, FSA does not provide non-partners with copies of the data until it has gone through all of its Quality Control. Partners receive access to the data much quicker. Larry was asked if FSA plans to develop 1-meter accuracy imagery ever year? Larry indicated that current FSA plans call for new 1-meter imagery on a 5 year cycle. Larry also indicated that a related questions was, assuming that we wanted to partner, how do we partner? It would probably need to be through a state agency other than this entity.

#### **STREET CENTERLINE – ADDRESS DATABASE UPDATE:**

USGS Partnership Fund Application. Larry noted that the Str. Cmte. had already discussed the USGS Partnership Fund grant application. As part of that application, NDOR had committed itself to taking on the role of data steward and integrator for a statewide transportation/street address database. The proposal in the grant application is that NDOR

would build on the earlier work that CALMIT had done to integrate the street centerline/address data from 17 local counties into the statewide TIGER database. NDOR would take this data and integrate it with the NDOR maintained state and local street and highway centerline data to create a "best available" statewide street centerline/address database. This data would be served online through a cooperative effort between NDOR and NDNR and be made available to the National Map. As part of this process, NDOR would also be looking at way to maintain an on-going, "best available" through update this dataset with enhanced street data produced by local governments, the Public Service Commission, the Census Bureau, or NDOR itself.

Advisory Committee on Transportation/Street Address Databases. Larry reported that the initial meeting of this Advisory Committee was held yesterday in conjunction with the Nebraska I-Team meeting. The basic thrust of the initial meeting was to outline the issues to be explored. Larry reported that it is clear that there are a lot of initiatives going on regarding this street centerline address data. The Public Service Commission, as part of its Phase 2 Cellular E911 work, is going to be contracting with vendors to create the county-by-county street address databases. The Census Bureau is making a major upgrade of TIGER line files, with a goal of 7.6-meter accuracy for all of the roads. They are going to want that available in 2010 and they have already let contracts for centerline enhancement for several Nebraska counties.

There is also new interest within the Nebraska Department of Revenue about a street centerline - address databases because Nebraska has joined a 23 state consortium to try to figure out how to recoup sales tax from catalog and Internet sales. To do that, they need to be able to get to vendors a database that says, if you live at this address, this is the sales tax. The most efficient way of doing that is by GIS. There are also various local initiatives occurring. In addition to outlining the issues to be explored, much of the Advisory Committee's discussion related to how we might put something into place, both an institutional process but also a database model by which we might, grab these various data enhancement efforts, integrate them and maintain a reasonably current "best available" database on an ongoing basis.

The Advisory Committee learned that it is the apparent intent by the Public Service Commission to actually fund not only the development of this data, but also to fund the on-going maintenance of this data on a county-by-county basis, through private vendors. The PSC initial focus is on 40 counties that they feel are ready for a certain level of Phase2 Cellular E911 enhancement. PSC's work will be funded by the fee on cellular calls, which goes into a state fund set up to support Phase 2 development. The PSC plan for on-going maintenance of this data was new information for most folks on the Advisory Committee. As a consequence, the committee may need to rethink its model/process and figure out how all the other uses of this data might be built around these PSC plans. Larry indicated that he went into this meeting with the understanding that PSC was going to contract out for a one-time development of this data in certain counties as they reach a certain phase of E911 development and somehow the data was going to be maintained locally. So, PSC plans open a new window for how this data might be developed and maintained. Between now and the next Advisory Committee meeting, we need to flush out the realities of this situation. So there is a lot of coordination needed in this area. Larry indicated he still thinks it makes sense for Roads to take on a data integration and stewardship role, because the Public Service Commission is focused on a county by county E911 enhancement process and does not appear to be interested in a statewide data integration role. Larry indicated that a sub-group of the Adv. Cmte. will be meeting with the Public Service Commission to look at their data model and to explore how it might be integrated into an effort to meet the broader need for statewide street centerline - address data.

#### **NEBRASKA LAND RECORD MODERNIZATION STUDY AND PROPOSAL LAND INFORMATION SYSTEM PROGRAM:**

Update on Nebraska Land Information System Program Legislation. Jim Brown reported that the Nebraska Land Information System Program Act, LB 1169, and the Register of Deeds bill, LB 232, both died at the end of the session this year. LB 232 was up on General file and LB 1169 was in Committee. After our testimony on LB 1169 nothing happened on either one of them. Considering the past legislative session, I don't think LB 1169 could have done better than that. There was some hope for a while that LB 1169 might be attached to LB 232, but Jim believed that was wishful thinking, at best. Subsequently, the good news is that NACO did come on board in support of LB 1169 and Jim reported that it is his understanding that NACO is forming a committee to look at these two issues and try to combine them into one. Jim indicated he felt the Str. Cmte. would have some input to help make that happen and that we will have to get the bill in the hopper by October. That gives us a two-year session to try to get a bill passed. Jim reported that is not a lot of opposition, except from the realtors and the land title people. The realtors oppose it because when they transact real estate, more fees have to be paid. Jim noted that there was some opposition to LB 1169 from the Register of Deeds, but with them together, he hopes that opposition goes away.

Larry indicated that he thought that the two bill could easily merged. Senator Wehrbein introduced LB 1169 and Senator Smith introduced LB 232. The Register of Deeds bill is based on a recording fee and but it has a sunset provision in it,

after 5 years the fee goes away. Supporters of the more comprehensive, LB 1169, did not disagree with the Reg. of Deeds fee, and felt it was reasonable for them to have that for 5 years and then those funds could be made available to the broader Land Information System Program. There was concern about the needs for some standards, so that if the Register of Deeds comes up with a process for scanning their documents, for example, that it not be based on a proprietary system so it could be plugged into a broader land information system. Larry indicated that he thought there is a lot of room for compromise.

Jim noted that we have a committee and will put the standards on the front burner before legislature comes through and hopefully have something ready in case we do get the legislation. Jim felt that the two bills are compatible because if we had all of the money on day one, we could not use it. We simply need to develop the people and the institution to use it and the Reg. of Deeds need the money early on. So it makes sense to let them have the money early on and then phase them out and phase us in, so it is a win-win situation. We will have the same senators and hopefully the same sponsors on the bill so we are in a best-case scenario.

Update on Follow-up Efforts on Study's Recommended. Larry reported that an initial meeting of the Land Record Modernization Standards Advisory Committee had been held that morning. Larry noted that the committee is focusing on 2 x 2 matrix, attribute data and spatial data, and standards related to additional funding and those related to no new funding. Under the assumption that if it passes then there will be some money flowing in from the government so it makes sense to put some standards in place. Or if there were no new money then it still makes sense that a reduced subset of standards may be appropriate. We had two private vendors added to our committee that we did not have before when we did land record guidelines, and their input was very helpful. Their sense is that many counties, even if there is no money, want some fairly clear guidance on standards.

#### **ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE OFFICERS:**

Larry noted that the rules and procedures that the Str. Cmte. had adopted to govern election of officers had been distributed to members at the previous meeting and that they were available online as a link to the agenda. Larry also noted that Jim Brown had indicated that he was not interested in serving another term as Chair.

Jim Brown opened the floor for nominations for Chair of the Str. Cmte. Jim nominated John Miyoshi as Chair. Lash Chaffin seconded the nomination. No other nominations were made and the Str. Cmte. voted to elect John Miyoshi as Chair.

Jim Brown open the floor for nominations for Vice Chair. Duane Stott was nominated, but he declined the nomination. Jim nominated Steve Schafer, who while Jim indicated that Steve could not attend this meeting, he did indicate his willingness to serve as Vice Chair, if nominated. Mark Kuzila seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations for Vice Chair and the committee voted to elect Steve Schafer.

Jim Brown passed the gavel to John who chaired the rest of the meeting.

#### **NEBRASKA ENTERPRISE GIS COORDINATING AND IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURE:**

Draft Report – State Model for Geographic Information Technology Coordination. Larry shared with the Str. Cmte. a draft report on state GIS coordinating structures that was compiled by the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC). NSGIC is national organization of state GIS coordinating bodies. Larry noted that this report was based on an effort by NSGIC to define a “model” state GIS coordinating structure and then a state-by-state survey to determine how each state fairs relative to the “model”. Larry indicated that he felt that Nebraska could learn from this process and see how our state coordinating structures compare with a widely shared view of an idea model and how they compare with other states.

Larry outlined the nine criteria NSGIC used to define its model coordinating structure, the related questions that NSGIC used in its survey and his answers to those questions.

**1) Has your state designated a full-time, paid coordinator position that has the authority to implement the state's business and strategic plans?**

No, Larry noted that while he is full-time, neither he nor the GIS Str. Cmte. has the authority to implement the state's business or strategic plans.

**2) Does a clearly defined authority exist for statewide coordination of geospatial information technologies and**

**data production?**

Yes.

**3) Does your statewide coordination office have a formal relationship with the state's Chief Information Officer (or similar office)?**

No, Larry noted that while we certainly have a good informal relationship, but there is no formal connection with his position and Steve's position.

**4) Do you have a champion (politician or executive decision-maker) that is aware and involved in the process of coordination?**

Yes, Larry indicated that his response to this question was a tough call and he thinks he was pushing it with this response. Larry noted that we have John Erickson, who is in the Governor's Policy Research Office, and Steve Schafer who is the State CIO, so it was based on those two that he answered yes. However, Larry also noted that we don't have anyone, for example, in the Legislature that is a point person for the broader range issues upon which we work.

**5) Does your state have assigned responsibilities for developing the National spatial Data Infrastructure and a State Clearinghouse?**

Yes, Larry indicated that again this is an area in which he felt his answer was pushing with his response, but he noted we have fairly clearly said that the Clearinghouse should be developed at DNR and we are in the process of doing that. We have also identified for a number of the core framework databases, what agencies should be responsible for developing and maintaining those, probably the biggest hole is the street address database but I think we are well on the way of getting that.

**6) Does your state have mechanisms to work and coordinate with local governments, academia, and the private sector?**

Yes.

**7) Does a sustainable funding source exist to meet projected needs?**

No, Larry noted that this was a common response by most of the other states.

**8) Does your state GIS Coordinator have the authority to enter into contracts, and receive or expend funds?**

No.

**9) Does the Federal government work through your statewide coordinating authority?**

Yes.

Nationwide, 49 states responded to the survey. The assessment was overall better than NSGIC expected. There were no regional patterns that appeared. Eight states met all nine of the criteria and 19 met eight criteria, 31 met six or more criteria, 18 met less than six. Nebraska met five of the criteria based on Larry's answers. The most consistent problem was the lack of sustainable funding with only 13 states feeling they had that. The next most consistent problem was regarding implementation authority and only 29 out of 49 states indicated they felt they had that. Larry recapped that according to these criteria, Nebraska has weaknesses in the following areas: no authority to implement business or strategic plans; no authority to enter contracts or receive expense bonds; no sustainable sources to meet project needs with Revenue and no formal relationship with the CIO.

Larry also observed that there is an ever increasing trend for federal agencies to look to state coordinating structures as the vehicle for developing, maintaining and distributing geospatial data. For example the National Map is being maintained through partnerships with the state entities. Another example would be FSA wanting to find a state partner for the DOQs. Parallel with this trend is the increasing availability of federal funding and grants to help state coordinating entities to develop needed data. Related to this is how much time and energy it takes to raise a relative small amount of money from interagency sources and then find an avenue through which one can legitimately spend those committed funds. We do not have the structures in place to do the things we are increasingly being asked to do, such as the Land Information Systems Program, Street Address Program and the integrate that data from the local government level.

Larry noted that we originally developed an intentionally decentralized structure, which initially served us well. But Larry indicated that from his perspective, as a coordinator who is attempting to respond to this changing geospatial policy and implementation landscape, Nebraska needs to update its structures and procedures that were originally put in place over a decade ago and have not been substantially modified since then.

One member (*identity not clear on tape*) stated that he would agree with Larry's assessment of the Nebraska's current situation, but he indicated that he was a little surprised that there are 31 states that are better than we are. He asked Larry if he thought their assessments were a little more generous than his assessment?

Larry indicated that it was really hard to say. At one point we were fairly advanced. If we had done this 5-6 years ago, I think we would have rated fairly high. We had a structure that had a local government involved that many did not have. We were statutory based. He was working full-time where many did not have a full-time coordinator. Larry observed that to some extent as these kind of coordinating institutions get created, the later they are created they can learn from everybody else what is needed, what works, and what kind of structures should be put in place based on the current situation. Not only is technology changing fast, but also there have been great changes in the relationships of between state agencies and between the federal and state agencies with regard to this technology. USGS, over the last few years has gone through huge changes. Within the geospatial data user community, there is a growing realization that agencies must coordinate and in the development and maintenance of geospatial data, and as much as possible, it makes sense develop this data at the local or state government level.

Larry was then asked who he sees taking the lead to restructure the Str. Cmte. and his role to better address our current situation. Larry indicated that he felt the Str. Cmte. could take a significant role in defining what revised structure should look like. He also indicated that both John Erickson and Steve Schafer, in their respective roles in the Governor's Policy Research Office and State CIO would have much to offer in this regard. Major GIS user agencies such as NDNR, CSD-UNL and Roads would need to be involved in defining alternative structures and possibly in some formal combination to support these structures.

Jim Brown noted that one of the first votes the Str. Cmte. took whether we wanted to support a centralized GIS for the State of Nebraska or did we want a decentralized but coordinated GIS for the State of Nebraska. We voted on having the decentralized, but coordinated, GIS for the State of Nebraska. Jim said he is not sure he would have voted the same way today, but we did vote that way at the time. Jim also noted that the states that have high marks all have one centralized agency. Their model was designed after those states. They are the movers and the shakers of GIS in state government. Jim indicated that he thought the NSGIC study was slanted to some extent. For instance:

2. **Does a clearly defined authority exist for statewide coordination of geospatial information technologies and data production?** We said right away we did not want to build ours that way. So that question will never work for us.
3. **Does your statewide coordination office have a formal relationship with the state's Chief Information Officer (or similar office)?** We just got through electing the Chief Information Officer on as our vice-chair. That may or may not be formal, but it is pretty tight coordination.
4. **Do you have a champion (politician or executive decision-maker) that is aware and involved in the process of coordination?** We are gaining a champion now but it is just a matter of luck and a matter of that person working on it.
7. **Does a sustainable funding source exist to meet projected needs?** Now that one really pains us. We need to do sustainable funding and we are working on that with LB 1169, but we also need to work with the Chief Information Officer and DAS to find a way to set up the funding, like Larry said, so when the money is funded into us we have a clean and smooth way to move. Everything done in this report is not bad. Not all of our misses are bad misses. Some of the things we do better than anyone else does, and we cannot go back and decide to go centralized. But maybe with LB 1169 we might want to look at that and make a better tie with DAS and us so DAS has the mechanism to fund it since they are set up to do revolving funds. Maybe we need to create a short paragraph in LB 1169 to do that. If LB 1169 goes in then enough money is dedicated for Records Modernization at the county level and enough money is coming back into the state that it is going a long ways in sustainable funding.

#### **REPORT ON NEBRASKA I-TEAM MEETING:**

Larry indicated that he thought most of the issues discussed at the Nebraska I-Team meeting had already been covered in the agenda. Larry noted that this I-Team model seems to be falling by the wayside in a lot of states, but that he feels that an every six months of gathering the broader community is still a worthwhile process. One of the main benefits of yesterday's I-Team was the opportunity to get a broader feeling about the perceived needs for FSA imagery in the future.

Ray Fox said he thought there were some other really interesting ideas. He noted that Kim Menke had brought up the fact that the National Map shows the 8 data layers, but it is not designed for some of the other good Nebraska data that is available and so someone came up with the idea of needing a Nebraska View. There seemed to be a lot of interest in the I-Team and good ideas from those attending.

#### **NEBRASKA GIS/LIS ASSOCIATION:**

It was reported that the GIS/LIS Association has its annual meeting coming up on the 17<sup>th</sup> at the Hastings Community College. Part of that will include the election of board members and officers in the association. We also have three nominations for three awards that we will be handing out this year. The Association is also doing the kickoff for the planning committee for the next symposium, which will be May 23-26, 2005.

#### **REPORT ON GIS ACTIVITIES FROM MEMBER AGENCIES:**

**Sudhir, NGPC:** For the last six months I have been working on developing a comprehensive conservation plan for the State of Nebraska. For the final project we need to design areas to focus on soil conservation. Several things need to be mapped so it is going to be a long process.

**Scott, Omaha:** We got our photography done this spring. The weather cooperated for the first time ever and we got it well before leaf-on conditions. We got a little rain so we got a little bit of green, too, which will improve the color conditions of our photography. We won't see any of the digital data until much later this year. There is a Douglas County GIS Coordinator position that we have the funding for. We had talked about getting that person onboard around July 1. There is a lot of GIS activity in the county so I think having this person to coordinate all of the city, county work being done is really going to help and be cost effective.

**Steve, Surveyors Office:** John Beran is talking with Roads about incorporating some of their section corner data.

**Mark, CSD-UNL:** There is quite a bit going on. Les has been working with NRCS on digital soil surveys. We have about 15 counties done now. They are available on CD ROMS, in HTML format and hopefully user friendly. CALMIT is doing a lot of work. Sunil is working right now with NEMA. They are working with the UNL police department on GIS for the football stadiums. This would facilitate evacuation of the football stadiums. I even asked one ground water modelers to work with them. We wanted to know, based on ground water modeling, that if there was a problem in the northwest corner, how could you move people out of that building. Our thoughts are, if we would have a problem in Lincoln Nebraska, then we would have problems in many other areas, too. Our police department went to the Super Bowl this year and Houston, Texas had no plan (in effect).

**Dick, NDOR:** We took our NECTAR web mapping applications, with some written data, and railroad data out to the five NACO district meetings and showed it to the highway superintendent and county surveyors. We worked with Kathy Russell from Kearney, who GPS'd her signs, culverts, and small bridges, and we were able to take that into the application. We were able to show the ladies and gentlemen what we could do for them and we have not been invited to the Summer Conference of the Highway Superintendents in Valentine. They want to look at a standard for what we would do for at least those three other attributes. Our lawyers still will not let us put it up for just anyone to view but we have a way, through passwords, to let them get in and get that information. So they will actually have a chance to have some GIS technology and not have any investment in software and people. They can just run it through their browsers. I will be hosting, April 3-6, 2005, the GIS for Transportation Symposium at the Lincoln Cornhusker. That will bring in my peers, NPOS, and vendors nationwide. Last year we had about 320 in Rapids City about a month ago.

**Alan, NPPD:** Our GIS system is still up and running. We have a few utilities interested in what we have going on. Our crews are looking at 911 addresses for our substations. Where can I get that and whom can I contact? Our concern is that we have people at the substation and if we have an injury or something and need to get a

rescue squad out there, which is the best way. Jim Langtry indicated that Lancaster County looked at addresses for their substations, but they were not sure what kind of address everyone meant.

**Kim, NDNR:** We are working on the National Map with USGS. We are working on the front end for the clearinghouse.

**Ray, USGS:** We have been working with NDNR (DOQs, DEMs, NHD) for several years with some very good partnerships for both of us. Josh is moving along on the NHD, so it looks like we will be moving along to the South Platte River Basin.

**Jim, Lancaster County:** Recently, we have received proposals from a number of consultants and our group is putting together a master plan. Our city/county group, as diverse as it is with all of our cooperating agencies we've all been so busy and we went our own ways, however we do coordinate somewhat. So hopefully this master plan will bring us together, allow us to take a look at what we have and give us better direction over the years. We will be bringing consultants in over the next couple of weeks to do some interviews. Also, we are working with ESRI on developing a Migration Plan to migrate all of our data into the GEO-databases. We are still operating, predominantly with coverage's and layers, etc. By getting that converted over to GEO-databases it makes it more valuable to other users with a possibility of tying that in with the National Map. Also, we have received all of the LIDAR data that we had a cooperative project with USGS on. We are in the process of doing some Quality Control and taking out some of the false readings, etc.

**John Miyoshi, LPNNRD:** At the NRD one of our most interesting projects is just starting its second year. We are working with 7 counties with their weed superintendents and after detailing the location of various noxious weeds and getting lat/longs we are going to try to get them out there to see if they are still there or not. We did put in for an environmental trust grant to increase some of the pressure on particularly the purple blue stripe and we are just getting a website up on that in an attempt to get public involvement in any other weed infestations. We have an education program and we put on some soil conservation and ground water programs at various schools. The most popular educational program is the geo-cache with the GPS unit and the second most popular is taking the GPS unit, telling the children to run and see if they can get the highest number on it.

Vote Tallies for 2/26/04 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting									
	Roll Call	Min #1	Chair #2	V.Chair #3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
DAS - <u>Steve Schafer</u>	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
DEQ - <u>Tom Lamberson, Paul Yamamoto</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
CSD - <u>Mark Kuzila</u> <u>Jim Merchant, Les Howard</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
NGPC - <u>Bruce Sackett</u> <u>Sudhir Ponnapan</u>	A	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
NRC - <u>Kim Menke,</u> <u>(Roger Patterson)</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
PTD - <u>Cathy Lang</u> <u>Bob Martin</u>	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
PRO - <u>Lauren Hill</u> <u>John Erickson</u>	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
DOR - <u>Dick Genrich</u> <u>Ed Kelley, (John Craig)</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
St.Surv - <u>Jim Brown</u> <u>John Beran, Steve Cobb</u>	A/P	.	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
Clk of Leg. - <u>Patrick O'Donnell</u> <u>Judy Backhaus</u>	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sonia Sebree	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<u>John Miyoshi,</u> <u>Steve Cacioppo</u>	P	+	NV	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Alan J. Beierman</u>	P	NV	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Cliff Welsh</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Larry Worrell</u> <u>Jim Langtry</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Lash Chaffin</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Duane Stott</u>	P	+	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Scott McIntyre</u> <u>Joan Green</u>	A/P	.	+	+	.	.	.	.	.
<u>Dick Nelson</u> <u>Chris Chalmers</u>	A	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<b>TOTALS</b>	11/13 - P	10 +	12 +	13 +	.	.	.	.	.

"P"=present, "A"=absent, "+"=voting for, "-"=voting against, "NV"=not voting