

Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes -- July 6, 2000

Present were (authorized to vote *):

Mahendra Bansal	+	Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Lash Chaffin	+	League of Municipalities
John Erickson	+	Nebraska Health and Human Services
Marcella Ganow		MATC - University of Nebraska Lincoln
Dick Genrich	+	Department of Roads
Val Goodman	+	Legislature
Erik Hubl		Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Ed Kelley		Department of Roads
Tom Lamberson	+	Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality
Jim Langtry	+	Lancaster County
Rod Larsen		Lamp Rynearsen
Josh Lear		Nebraska Department of Natural Resources
Bob Martin	+	Department of Property Assessment and Taxation
Jim Merchant	+	Conservation and Survey Division - University of Nebraska Lincoln
Margaret Miller		University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Jeff Pealu		University of Nebraska - Omaha
Steve Peaslee	+	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Scott Richert	+	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Steve Schafer	+	Chief Information Officer
Doug Steinke		Central Platte NRD
Duane Stott	+	Scottsbluff County
Mike Thompson		Department of Natural Resources
Cliff Welsh	+	Nebraska Association of County Officials
Paul Yamamoto		Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality
Larry Zink		GIS Steering Committee Coordinator

Complete Meeting Agenda

MAJOR MEETING TOPICS

DOQ/DEM Update

Strategic Planning Document

Objectives

Internal Strengths

External Opportunities

Spatial Data Infrastructure Components

Future Systems Vision

Hydrographic Update

Proposed Focus

Internal Weaknesses

External Threats

Strategic Plan

Initiatives

Voting Record

NOTICE OF MEETING: A public notice of the meeting, pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R. S. 1943, was published in the Lincoln Journal-Star on Thursday, June 29, 2000.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Lash Chaffin called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. and requested a call of the roll. Thirteen duly authorized representatives were present at the time of the roll call. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES: Chairperson Lash Chaffin requested approval for the May 11, 2000 minutes. seconded. No discussion was desired, so Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed. (see vote #1 on Voting Record sheet).

REVISED 2000-01 MEETING SCHEDULE: Larry explained that parking permits from UNL will no longer be issued free of charge. The cost will be \$2 per tag. A motion was made and seconded to revise the GIS Steering Committee meeting schedule and location of meetings, as proposed by Larry. The motion passed (see vote #2 on Voting Record sheet).

REVIEW OF NON-PLANNING ITEMS:

DOQ/DEM DATABASES UPDATE: Mahendra Bansal reported that the pilot project concerning the revision and second generation of DEMs and DOQs for Lancaster County is complete. The methodology, database standards, and production procedures are established; 10 meter DEMs and DOQs base on the first method of aerotriangulation. There is a need to revise the DOQs statewide conforming to the 1999 NAPP imagery. This is a database which is extensively used by all levels of government (as a base map layer) for multitudes of applications. The DNR is looking into the resources to take up this project, and is working with the USGS to draft an agreement for a statewide coverage.

Dick Genrich moved to support and recommend the development of second generation DOQs and DEMs. Cliff Welsh seconded.

There was some discussion about whether to consider this project in relation to prioritization of Steering Committee efforts. In the past, the development of other priority databases, such as hydrography, have come before this one. It was noted that the Steering Committee had not yet received a report or recommendation from its DOQ/DEM Database Advisory Committee. Jim Merchant pointed out that the motion was only to support DNRs efforts to develop the database, not for the Steering Committee to take action. Cliff added that if this is ready to be done, there is no reason not to recommend it.

The motion passed (see vote #2 on Voting Record sheet).

HYDROGRAPHIC PROJECT: Larry reported that the hydrographic pilot project in the Logan Creek watershed up in northeastern Nebraska is still in process. The committee is to the point where the question of how much revision would be done to enhance scanned and vectorized line work off of the quad sheets needed to be addressed. The guidelines proposed include utilizing the '93 DOQs.

The Committee determined that if a one-dimensional stream was on the seven and a half minute topo map, it would be revised to be corrected based on the DOQ. If it was not on the topo map but showed up on the DOQ it would not be captured. All water bodies would be revised to the DOQs. It is possible that toward the end of the process, the decision may be made to delete any body that does not meet the size requirements.

Two dimensional stream segments will also be edited to match the DOQs. Zero dimensional features, such as wells, will not be captured in this database. Areas where DLGs do not exist, new line work will be created utilizing heads up digitizing based on DOQs, using the DRGs as a reference in terms of what to digitize.

Cliff asked when the project would be completed. Larry said they hope to have it completed by the end of next month so that they have some idea of what resources will be required. Cliff asked if this was the beginning of a statewide initiative. Larry indicated that the intent was to assess resource requirements for a statewide initiative. Jim Langtry asked if these guidelines were intended to carry on beyond the pilot project. Larry said that was why this Committee wanted Steering Committee approval. Jim Langtry asked if the latest available DOQs would be used now that they are being developed. Larry explained that it had been discussed, but that they decided that there would likely not be that much difference between the two generations. Also, if the 99' DOQs are used, the project will have to wait until the DOQs are available statewide to ensure consistency across the database.

Josh added that 93' was a wet year which means more surface water was visible.

Larry explained that these guidelines represent a significant labor commitment. They have discovered in the pilot project that a lot of channel changing that has occurred since the original quad maps were created and while revising them to the '93 DOQs will be a require a lot of work, it will result in a much more current and valuable product. These are likely to be the guidelines used across the entire state.

Cliff asked how much time it will take to complete the statewide effort. Josh said they have no idea since the methodology is not set yet and a lot depends on how long it takes to digitize places with no DLGs available. Mike added that in other states where this has been done, such as Florida, it took five to six years because they had to create the DLGs first. In Kansas, where most of the line work has already been done, completion of a statewide database only took two years.

Larry said that it appears that there are some funds available for this project from a variety of sources including the new DNR,

DEQ, NRCS, and Game and Parks. However, it has not come together as a statewide effort, and there is some question as to how to pull together interagency resources to most effectively address this as a coordinated effort.

GIS 2001 SYMPOSIUM: Larry reported that planning is moving ahead for a May 2001 Nebraska GIS Symposium. It will be sponsored by the GIS/LIS Association, with possible GIS Steering Committee co-sponsorship. Larry indicated that before the Steering Committee's name was used in promotion, he wanted to check to make sure that the Steering Committee was supportive of co-sponsorship again. Larry also noted that last year the profits went to support the Association and he wanted to confirm that the Steering Committee was also comfortable with that arrangement again. There was no objection to either issue.

STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENT: Lash explained that pursuant to the directive from the last GIS Steering Committee meeting, the Executive Committee met to discuss the need for a strategic plan.

Larry said that the Executive Committee directed him to create a draft document to include motions, resolutions, advisory committees and other initiatives undertaken by the Steering Committee in the past. There are also elements in this document that are not the result of a Steering Committee motion and represent Larry's own thoughts and ideas. Those are clearly marked.

There was a fair amount of discussion about what the scope of this project would be. Jim Brown pointed out that the Steering Committee does not have the time or resources to develop a strategic plan for Nebraska. In struggling with this issue, Larry drafted a plan for coordinated GIS development. Located within the document is the statement "The question is not whether these public investments in GIS will be made; the question is whether they will be made in a coordinated manner so as to maximize overall public return on these investments." This statement represents what Larry would propose as a focal point for this effort. In drafting this plan, Larry relied heavily on the CJIS strategic plan.

The actual strategic plan of this document is a mission statement, goals, primary assumptions for the future, and a list of potential projects that fit these goals. The vision is based on a concept developed by the Steering Committee four years ago to address the issue of decentralized but integrated effort. This is where ideas will be put regarding what the Committee proposes to do next year, how much that will cost, and projected timelines.

Jim Merchant asked what the audience for this document will be and if it addresses a statutory requirement. Steve Schafer explained that the Steering Committee is recognized in statute and has the opportunity to put together a comprehensive plan. The audience ultimately is the NITC and persons involved in the budget process and will be used as a point of reference to support GIS efforts and budget requests. Mike Calvert, a fiscal analyst from the budget office has commented before that when a budget request comes in backed by an agency's ongoing planning process, it is likely to be taken more seriously than if it comes in alone. If it is also part of a broader planning effort, then the appropriations committee takes more notice.

The CJIS group was a process involving efforts from all aspects of criminal justice, where individuals from state and local law enforcement got together to identify where their data sharing opportunities exist. They then came forward with a very ambitious set of proposals for improving data sharing among these groups.

Lash commented that the CJIS document was used to justify the hiring of consultants for further detailed reports. Steve Schafer added that CJIS has been highly successful in acquiring federal money as well.

Proposed Focus for the Strategic Plan

Tom Lamberson expressed concern that the plan as it is written includes considerable redundancy and that a simpler document will be better received. His proposed outline includes:

- Introduction and Background
- 4 Goals as identified by the Steering Committee
 - priority databases
 - land records
 - education/outreach
 - data sharing
 - Initiatives to support the goals
 - Where we are, where we are going, how we will get there listed under each goal

This model addresses funding as a means to achieve the proposed goals and does not include the Montana GIS cost benefit study because he could find no justification for including it. Steve Schafer maintained the position that the business case for GIS needs to be made in this document. Lash asked if it would be acceptable to use Tom's model for the main body and add

GIS themselves. Jim Langtry asked if that would not be better listed under coordination and management. Larry explained that these are listed in both places because they are initiatives that relate to the goal of developing priority geospatial databases.

Lash suggested listing specific steps that would be required under the priorities. Larry explained that this is only an outline and that additional text would be added later.

Larry asked if street addresses should be listed as a potential project for this initiative. Lash expressed concern that this had not been discussed or adopted by the Steering Committee and requested that a specific item be included on the agenda for the next meeting for this item.

The next question is whether the collaborative fund, geospatial data standards and GIS service bureau items should be listed in this document and, if so, whether they belong here. Jim Merchant said that it is unclear that these are not databases and they should be broken out as a separate paragraph. John Erickson said that there are other areas where these might be appropriately listed - collaborative development fund could go under data sharing and the geospatial data standards and GIS service bureau under education and outreach. Jim Merchant said that they do belong in this section because they do support database development. They can be listed elsewhere but this is a good place for them.

Lash suggested discussing whether they belong in the document at all to begin with. Lash indicated that he felt the collaborative development fund definitely needs to be incorporated somewhere within this document. Regarding the GIS Service Bureau, Larry explained that from time to time, he receives calls from state agencies without GIS capability wanting to do a particular GIS related project but there is no one in state government who has a generic service responsibility for GIS. It is a roadblock for agencies that would explore the technology if it did not involve a huge, up-front investment of hardware, software and personnel. Larry also noted that if a particular project does not fit clearly within a particular agency's area of responsibility, the Steering Committee is hampered in moving forward with coordinated efforts in the regard.

Jim Merchant pointed out that terming it a service bureau might raise some problems and that it might be better defined as technical assistance. There are a number of states with geospatial extension support service centers that are in charge of handling some of these responsibilities. It is a good concept but should be called something else. Another possible title is interagency technical assistance. Steve Schafer agreed that the need does exist regardless of what it is eventually named.

Lash suggested that this entity be defined as facilitating technical assistance because this covers a gamut of problems and issues.

Jim Merchant commented that the Steering Committee has requested funding in the past for an education and outreach person who would fulfill the functions outlined for the Service Bureau so a precedent is set for this type of request. The only piece that may not fit is the title GIS Service Bureau. Lash added that his impression was that the education and outreach section included some of these concepts and could be quite far reaching in theory.

Larry raised his concern with this approach, because what he is suggesting for consideration is much more than just technical assistance. He sees a need for a place for agencies to go to receive specific GIS services/products. Larry said that he has heard positive feedback with respect to the idea of a Service Bureau and that he believes that there is a need for this type of entity to prevent the necessity for every individual agency interested in the technology to be forced to invest in GIS technology and expertise, or not pursue GIS applications.

Lash clarified that there was no objection to the concept of providing interagency technical assistance under education and outreach. The second tier concept of a working entity to actually do some of these projects needs more discussion. Jim Langtry suggested tying this concept with the idea of Regional Centers. There is no reason this issue cannot be referenced in multiple places within the strategic plan.

Larry said that the Regional Center concept is the other closely related idea and developed out of the Land Record Modernization Committee. The idea is for state government to take an active goal in facilitating aggregation of demand and service for local government, in particular GIS mapping and surveying, especially in rural areas. It was drafted in a flexible manner to allow for the inclusion of more general computer technical assistance if that is necessary.

In discussions about this issue, there were state and local representatives. The state representatives were in favor of a more flexible structure, while the local participants were interested in creating an entity with state parameters so that there would be complete coverage, state structure, guidelines and standards.

There was some concern that counties that did not elect to participate in the Regional Center concept would receive the same

benefits as those who had chosen to participate and adhered to the given standards. Larry said that this is just a rough outline, drafted to determine if there was any support for the concept.

Lash said that there will be further discussion on this topic at the next meeting and expressed the desire to see this turned into an initiative. Larry asked if the Steering Committee wants to include a specific future plan with the strategic plan. Steve Schafer said that it was not necessary to outline specific dates of completion but that some prioritization lends credibility to the document. Larry asked if money figures were necessary. Steve Schafer said that some general numbers would be useful. Larry requested assistance from the Steering Committee to put together some numbers for the plan.

Larry asked for clarification on the Steering Committee's wishes relative to the overall format of the Strategic Planning document. Following further discussion, it was decided to move towards the model presented by Tom Lamberson, with Tom and Larry working together to develop a modified version.

Tom said that he would work with Larry to put together a sample document for distribution to Steering Committee members prior to the next meeting. The meeting was adjourned.

Vote Tallies for 7/6/00 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting									
	Roll Call	Min. #1	Mtg. Schedule #2	DOQs-DEMs #3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
DAS - Steve Schafer	P	NV	+	NV
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling, Paul Yamamoto	P	NV	+	+
CSD - Mark Kuzila Jim Merchant, Jim Lacy	P	+	+	+
NGPC - Mele Koneya Bruce Sackett	A
NRC - Dayle Williamson Mahendra Bansal	P	+	+	NV
PAT - Cathy Lang, Bob Martin, Scott Gaines	A/P
PRO - Lauren Hill Dan Hoffman	A
DOR - Dick Genrich, Ed Kelley	P	+	+	+
St.Surv - Jim Brown	A
LRD - Val Goodman	P	NV	+	+
Nathan McCaleb, Steve Peasley, Kelly Klenke	P	+	+	+
John Miyoshi, Doug Steinke	P	+	+	+
Blaine Dinwiddie, Steve Larson	A
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	P	+	+	+
Lash Chaffin	P	+	+	+
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+
Dennis Wilson	A
Dick Nelson, John Erickson	P	+	+	+
TOTALS	13 - P/ 14 - P	10	12	11

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