

Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes -- July 23, 1998

Present were (authorized to vote "+"):

Mahendra Bansal	.	Natural Resources Commission
John Beran	.	State Surveyor's Office
Jim Brown	+	State Surveyor
Dennis Burling	+	Department of Environmental Quality
Lash Chaffin	+	League of Nebraska Municipalities
Dick Genrich	+	Department of Roads
Val Goodman	+	Legislative Computer Services
Les Howard	+	Conservation and Survey Division
Erik Hubl	.	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Micaela Johnson	.	USGS
Ed Kelley	.	Nebraska Department of Roads
Mark Kuzila	+	Conservation and Survey Division
Jim Langtry	+	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
Steve Larsen	+	OPPD
Jerry Odum	.	National Geodetic Survey/NOAA
Troy Pomajzl	.	Milestone Solutions, Inc.
Sandy Powell	.	City of Hastings, Engineering Dept.
Scott Richert	.	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Steve Schafer	.	DAS-Intergovernmental Data Services Division
Chris Stanton	.	USGS
Duane Stott	+	Scottsbluff County Surveyor
Stu Sutherland	.	Professional Surveyor's Association of NE
Darryl Williams	.	USGS
Dayle Williamson	+	Natural Resources Commission
Paul Yamamoto	+	Department of Environmental Quality
Larry K. Zink	.	Coordinator, GIS Steering Committee

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 July 16, 1998.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Jim Brown called the meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. and requested a call of the roll. Ten duly authorized representatives were present at the time of the roll call. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES: Chairperson Jim Brown requested approval for the May minutes. Lash Chaffin moved for the minutes of the March 21, 1998 Steering Committee meeting to be approved as distributed. Dayle Williamson seconded the motion. Dennis Burling requested that the phrase 'unanimously passed' be changed throughout the minutes to 'the motion passed', as not all of the Steering Committee members are present. Dayle Williamson asked that on page seven the sentence reading 'Dayle explained his agency had offered to do GPS for Merrick County but they had refused' be changed to read, 'Dayle explained his agency had offered to do GPS for Merrick County but received no response.' The minutes were approved as amended (see vote #1).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR MULTI-PURPOSE LAND INFORMATION

SYSTEMS: Erik Hubl reported that the Advisory Committee met this morning. They had intended to release the base map section for review. They found a few last minute edits that they wanted to make on it. They discussed the edits and adopted them today. The edited version will soon be available on the web site. The edits were fairly minor, dealing with a 1/12,000-scale reference on page 5 and page 17. In the original resolution that created the Advisory

Committee, a duration of one year was set for them to work on this task. In that time, they have completed a table of contents, outlining the desirable topics of the Nebraska GIS Guidebook. As a committee, they placed their emphasis on four core elements: geodetic control, base map, cadastral data, and attribute data. They have completed a glossary of terms to be included which has continued to evolve and grow as new sections and concepts are added. They have circulated for review the geodetic control section and the draft of the base map section. They have in process the cadastral and attribute sections. Those will complete the four core elements. They have also put their work out on a WebPages, which they had not originally intended to do. Finally, they are having a continuing discussion with the Property Tax Division on their tax map and regulations. The Property Tax Division has established a goal of having new tax mapping regulations proposed by the end of the year. At this point, the Advisory Committee would like to request a continuance, as allowed in the original resolution. In addition, they would like to request funding from the GIS Steering Committee for travel expenses.

Dayle asked if providing a time extension would allow the Advisory Committee to go back and make some the necessary corrections. Erik replied that all of the work the Advisory Committee has put out is considered to be in draft form. They are actively seeking comments and feedback. These standards need to belong to everyone and be agreed upon by everyone. There is plenty of time to amend anything that is out there.

Larry asked at what point the Steering Committee would like the Advisory Committee's proposals to come before them for formal ratification. Initially, each section was to come before the Steering Committee for review before being circulated but there was a decision to speed up the process. There is now no clear path for these standards to come back to the Steering Committee. Dayle wanted to make sure that the Advisory Committee had plenty of time to develop documents they were secure with before formally presenting it to the Steering Committee. Jim Brown asked if Erik thought the geodetic control standards and base map standards would be polished enough by the next meeting for the Steering Committee to look at entertaining a motion for approval. Erik explained that the Advisory Committee was completely comfortable with the standards they had already released. Jim said that approval for those two sections needed to be put on the agenda for the next meeting. Larry commented that there has been very little feedback on these papers, which has caused some concern for the Advisory Committee. Dayle said that Brian Dunnigan has given extensive feedback but not all of it has been accepted. Erik commented that Brian came into the process a little bit late and he has only been able to attend two of the eight meetings they have had. Erik hopes Brian will be able to attend more meetings. Dayle explained that he wanted to make sure that the Advisory Committee had plenty of time and did not feel rushed through the process.

Lash asked how the Advisory Committee envisioned bringing these sections forward to the Steering Committee and if it was possible for them to achieve a different comfort level on each section. Erik said that because it was such a massive project, the easiest way to effectively approach it was in pieces. However, there was some concern that when they get to later sections, there might be references back up to the first sections and that there may be some changes there. These standards need to evolve through time anyway. After the Steering Committee votes on these standards, there might be things that come up a year later that need to be changed. Maintaining a flexible attitude will be the most constructive approach.

Jim Brown proposed that the members take a look at the draft sections posted on the web and offer their input by September 1. That will allow Larry to make the comments of the Committee available to all the members so that this topic can be discussed and voted on at the next meeting. Dayle clarified that Jim was asking the GIS Steering Committee members to review the geodetic control and base mapping standards. Jim said that Steering Committee members should turn their comments in to Larry who will get them back to the GIS Committee members two or three weeks before the next meeting. That will allow the Steering Committee members to be prepared to discuss this issue at the meeting. Larry pointed out that budget review would be on the agenda for the next meeting. Jim said that there is no way of knowing where the Committee will be with that process. The meeting may have to be moved to a week later and it may have to be an all day meeting. Standards are an important issue and if the Committee is prepared to discuss them, then the process can at least be started.

Lash asked if approval was needed for mileage funding. Dayle said it was. Jim Brown asked who was in need of mileage reimbursement. Erik said for people who were coming in from out of town. Duane is in town for the Steering Committee meeting so he is already compensated. However, Roy Hahn is driving in and Sandy Powell is driving in from Hastings. Jim said he did not know if it was needed but it would not hurt to have a motion to provide funding.

Dayle asked if the Steering Committee had the authority to confer funding. Larry indicated that if the Committee has the authority, he did not know if it had the funding. All the Steering Committee money is directly appropriated to reimburse members of the Steering Committee for travel expenses and what is available is used to reimburse only two members for six meetings a year. Dayle suggested deferring this part of the Advisory Committee's request. Dennis Burling asked if money received back from the conference was available. Jim Brown acknowledged that not much of the \$9,000 had been spent yet. Larry noted that the money was earmarked for educational purposes. Dennis suggested the possibility that this money be used to help develop standards and guidelines. Larry also noted that the Committee had been planning on using that money for the symposium. Dayle did not think that the Advisory Committee was asking for that much money. Larry suggested that it adds up when members are travelling far distances. Roy is coming from Scotts Bluff and Sandy comes from Hastings.

Larry suggested deferring this discussion until later in the agenda as part of the budget discussion for the next fiscal year. Jim Brown said that the bottom line was that the only funding available is the money from the symposium. Larry said there was originally \$9,000 in that fund and there is roughly \$7,000 left. The main expenses drawn from that have been to reimburse Duane for special education work he has been asked to do such as the NACO meeting. Dayle commented that he would like to support that effort because it is of statewide benefit. Lash said that it is a Committee work product that could be hired out. While he understands people are volunteering their time, it is a difficult situation because the money was not budgeted beforehand. He proposed dealing with this issue in the next budget. Dayle suggested deferring discussion until the budget is discussed.

Larry asked if there was a need to extend the Advisory Committee's mandate. Dayle Williamson moved to extend the Advisory Committee's mandate for another year. Lash Chaffin seconded the motion. The motion passed (*see vote #2*).

PLSS PILOT PROJECT UPDATE: Chairperson Jim Brown reported that it was still in process. They have done one balance on Adams County and returned that to the Bureau Land Management for their review. They had some input and made recommendations. Jim is beginning the second balance utilizing their recommendations to see what the difference is. They have fairly successfully imported the DOQQ's and are using those to check digitized control with. They moved into Dawson County. They have changed their method of operation in Dawson County and added something to this mapping that they have not done before. They are incorporating all of the resurvey records from the State Surveyor's office and supplementing the original survey data to try to get some more accuracy in the survey information. They found that they had a problem in Adams County, although the Adams County original surveys were much better than Dawson County. They felt they needed to get some better survey information. In Dawson County, they plan to include that information on the first pass. It takes a bit longer, though. The State Surveyor's office has a new person on staff, John Beran. Jim said that John will soon to be the new GMM expert in Nebraska. There is a revision coming in on the GMM software through the University of Maine to get it more into the Windows environment. They have asked Nebraska to participate and Jim is trying to come up with the money for it so that Nebraska will have some input in what goes into the software. As soon as John gets up to speed on the software, things will begin to move much faster.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: Larry Zink reported that one of the charges given to the Executive Committee was to look at the new responsibilities it was given as a result of the recommendations of the Planning and Process Subcommittee report. These responsibilities included taking on the finance goal, i.e. getting resources for the Steering Committee to do what it needs to do. Another responsibility is to periodically reflecting back to the Steering Committee how it is doing in terms of meeting its goals. The Executive Committee discussed and accepted these new responsibilities.

The Executive Committee discussed the budget needs of the Steering Committee and endorsed a proposal to again request an increase in the yearly-operating budget from \$3,000 to \$10,000. This is the same request that was made last year. They also encouraged the Education Committee to come forward with a budget proposal. Essentially the results closely mirror what the Steering Committee approved last year as part of the IT coordination initiative, that ultimately got cut in the Appropriations Committee.

There was an extensive discussion about the relationship of the GIS Steering Committee and the new information

technology coordinating bodies that were put in place. Bill Miller, who is the Administrator of the Division of Communications and also the interim Chief Information Officer, came to speak with the Executive Committee. They were exploring how the Steering Committee could plug into the budget review process for GIS-related proposals. Bill Miller suggested there was an opening for Steering Committee input. The struggle is the practical matter of how to do it. There is a very tight window in which input is useful. Ultimately, the Executive Committee decided that what they would like to try to do is have the office of the Chief Information Officer send copies of the GIS-related proposals to the Steering Committee. A subcommittee would sift through the initial pile of requests and make recommendations to the full Steering Committee, who would then act at its next meeting. It would work better in terms of the budget process timeline to move the next meeting back one week, to October 1. That leaves a lot of questions still open, such as what criteria will be used in reviewing proposals.

Larry suggested using review criteria and recommendation categories that were developed about four years ago in response to a request from the Legislature. This was part of the December 1994 Annual Report when they requested the Steering Committee come up with some process. Four general recommendation categories were developed as well. The four recommendation criteria are:

Highly recommended from an overall GIS implementation perspective

This means that it is a priority for the Steering Committee

Recommended from a GIS utilization perspective

Translated this looks like a good project and fits in with the agency's program. It makes sense, but it is not necessarily a high priority for the Steering Committee.

Neutral

Concerns or opposition

Given the short timeline, Larry believes that this is the best, practical approach to prioritizing and categorizing budget requests this year. There is not enough time or resources to come up with something else. Larry noted that the Executive Committee had only discussed this generally, so these specific categories are not a recommendation from them.

There was a brief discussion about sponsoring a GIS forum with some people from the University. The University has received grant money for doing research around geospatial data. They want to sponsor one or two forums for the GIS community to solicit input into the areas they should be working on. They asked for the endorsement of the Steering Committee and for the use of the Committee's mailing list. Jim Merchant is a part of this group. They put in a fairly general proposal and are attempting to fine tune areas they should be working on. The Executive Committee expressed support for this endeavor, subject to the approval of the Steering Committee.

There was a brief discussion about GIS software license. The state of Kansas has a statewide license with ESRI that allows state and local subdivisions to get a discount on ArcInfo software. Larry did not know if there was interest in Nebraska. He asked Kansas for a copy of their agreement, but Kansas is in the process of renegotiating. The question here is whether the Steering Committee wants to pursue this.

There was also discussion about efforts by Val Goodman who was pursuing a possible statewide database on Zip Plus 4. They were exploring the possibility of a statewide license. For four participants the cost is \$2,000, for five to twenty it is \$5,000.

There was a brief discussion about the state clearinghouse and the agreement with the State Records Board/Nebraska Online. There had been no time to work on polishing that agreement. Dennis came up with a revised draft which Larry has not had the opportunity to work with yet.

They reviewed the concept of putting together a rough job description and inviting federal representatives to a meeting to nominate two or three people to give to the Governor for possible representation. Larry has done some research and has not found any existing meetings that the Committee could use; so it appears it will have to be a meeting convened

by the Committee. The Governor's staff seems to be open to this sort of process.

Budget Review Process. Jim Brown said that the budget review proposal is probably the biggest decision point to be made. The Executive Committee concluded that the Steering Committee does not have any choice but to participate. The Committee does not have the resources or the time, but it needs to be done. Jim had written a letter to the Chief Information Officer and to the Policy Research office offering the services of the Steering Committee. The Committee will not initially be selecting proposals; they will surface as targeted GIS projects from the budget review process. There is a new and expanded program questionnaire in the budget where all agencies have to submit that sort of thing. That which is identified as being GIS-related by the Chief Information Officer and the budget review process would then be handed to the Steering Committee for recommendations. Within the two week window available, they had thought to convene an Executive Committee meeting to discuss the proposals and prioritize them based on the system developed previously and described by Larry. The proposals will then be brought back to the Steering Committee for approval and then passed back to the information officer. Since the time this process was discussed, Bill Miller has announced he is leaving state government and will no longer be the Chief Information Officer, but the offer still stands. Jim suggested a motion authorizing the Executive Committee to review these and bring them to the Steering Committee at the next meeting.

Lash Chaffin moved to have the Executive Committee review any GIS related budget items forwarded to them and have them ready for action at the next meeting. Dayle Williamson seconded the motion. Lash asked if that included utilizing the criteria set forth previously. Jim said he did not think there was much choice. That criteria was in place and there is a motion accepting that criteria for evaluating purchases. If this motion carries, the meeting date will need to be changed to October 1 and will likely need to start in the morning to allow adequate time.

Larry clarified that the proposal on the floor was that the Executive Committee would take on this task along with anyone else who is interested in sitting in. Jim stated that the Executive Committee was always open to anyone who wants to sit in. He added that because this is not a public forum, it would be inappropriate for any advocacy to be permitted by agencies represented on the Executive Committee. Jim did not know if his office would have any budget proposals for consideration, but he intends to step down and not be involved in approving or prioritizing any project relating to his office. Larry asked if moving the meeting date was included in the motion. Dayle said that was a necessity. Jim reiterated that there was a motion on the floor to change the meeting date to October 1 and confer responsibility for initial review of GIS related budget proposals to the Executive Committee. The motion passed (see vote #3).

Operational Budget Proposal. Larry explained that this referred to the proposal to request an increase the operating budget from \$3,000 to \$10,000. This will first go to Steve Schafer for consideration and inclusion in his budget. The other additional funds requested which will be addressed later in the meeting will be for staff to support educational efforts. Dayle said that at this point, code agencies do not have any guidance from the Governor's office as to what they should do regarding budget increases. Jim Brown commented that the Steering Committee did not do a good job in explaining their needs to the Appropriations Committee. \$3,000 is simply not enough as evidenced by the fact that subcommittees cannot meet because they do not have travel money. If the Steering Committee approves the proposal to request a budget increase, then Jim gave the assurance that they will try to do a better job getting the Appropriations Committee to understand why that money is needed.

Lash Chaffin moved that when the procedures become available, the Steering Committee ask for \$10,000 operational expenses. Dayle Williamson seconded the motion.

Val Goodman asked if there was a particular reason that \$10,000 was the number chosen. Jim said there was no hard and fast reason. \$3,000 covers the travel expenses for two people for six meetings a year and that is not adequate. \$6,000 would cover expenses for those two for one meeting a month. The additional funds would be used to cover travel expenses of other committee members, unexpected expenses, and items such as travel expenses for the subcommittee members. Larry pointed out that at this point the Steering Committee is not providing travel expenses for John Miyoshi, Dennis Wilson, and Blaine Dinwiddie. By statute, the Committee should do so. Lash said that if Blaine leaves the Committee, it is not unreasonable to think that the new member might be from Western Nebraska and that could blow the budget very quickly. Val said that when the budget request is for a 333% increase, there is likely to be more resistance. Jim said that they did a poor job of explaining last year and that this year they will have

to make an effort to ensure the Appropriations Committee understands why the money is necessary. Without it, people from outside of Lincoln cannot participate. Dennis added that the \$3,000 only covers six meetings a year. Larry said that at this point, the Steering Committee does not pay for postage or any other supplies; that comes out of IDSD's budget. Jim Brown called for the vote. The motion to request an increase in the operational budget from \$3,000 to \$10,000 passed (*see vote #4*).

Co-Sponsoring the UNL Forum. Jim explained that the Executive Committee told the folks organizing the Nebraska Forum on Geospatial Information Opportunities that the Steering Committee would co-sponsor it, subject to Steering Committee approval. Basically, the Steering Committee is lending their name to the forum, not providing any funding. This is a group of academia from the University of Nebraska who seems to have a good program. Jim requested a motion for the Steering Committee to formally accept co-sponsorship of this forum. Larry said that no date had been set yet. It is an exploratory meeting of a collection of researchers from different departments. They have grant funding from the Nebraska Research Initiative and want to work with business, particularly in the area of geospatial data to determine what opportunities or areas they should be looking at. Jim Merchant is a member of the group, as well as several other UNL and UNO faculty members.

Dick Genrich moved to cosponsor the forum. Dayle Williamson seconded the motion. Lash commented that when Kay Orr was governor, she did a big project to get money pumped into the engineering college from Nebraska businesses and that is what the Nebraska Research Initiative is. There is a group of key engineering professors and business leaders who form a committee and come up with ideas for forums and such. Larry called the roll. The motion passed to co-sponsor the forums (*see vote #5*).

REPORTS ON INITIAL ASSESSMENTS OF PRIORITY DATABASES:

- a. **Geodetic Control** – The State Surveyor's Office, as the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Geodetic Control database, made a report available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Jim Brown explained that his definition of geodetic control database to be the physical monuments and data. The primary stakeholders in this involve anyone doing high accuracy surveying. The current data set is somewhat fragmented. The main data set comes from the National Geodetic Survey office. The first order monuments are now balanced and available on CD-ROM. There are other data sets out there, such as Department of Roads, power districts and people who have data sets for their own use that have not been submitted for inclusion into the national set. It is possible to include into the national set work if done by blue book but that is getting more difficult. Lancaster County has a large set right now as well. Those additional sets are not readily available or accessible. The National Geodetic Survey set is readily available. A CD-ROM is available to the public from NGS.

One of the problems surfacing when dealing with including additional data sets into the national set is that as time passes, information on hard monuments is becoming less and less important. Currently, a lot of the work is being done by conventional survey methods. When conventional methods are utilized, it is very important to have a monument within a couple of miles of where you are working. However, as surveying moves more and more into GPS, that requirement extends out to as far twenty miles. The national set is good at twenty miles. If using the national set, everything needed to do geodetic control is there. If working with conventional techniques, the information is not there and the other data sets are needed.

As time goes on, people are connecting less and less with conventional methods and utilizing GPS more and more. One major issue with developing this database is cost effectiveness. If the database can be created quickly and cheaply, it would be of use. If it takes five years or so to put it together, then it will be largely obsolete by the time it is operational. The geodetic surveyors in Nebraska are fairly knowledgeable about what is out there

Jim has serious reservations about whether the inclusion of this data set or whether any further development of the data set is a necessary function at this time. At this point, Jim does not see a driving need for this database. Jim clarified that this was a matter of priorities. He would like to devote time and energy to a lot of different projects, but as a priority, this seems to be low on the scale.

Erik said that it is an easy data set to create and that he has relied on the NGS data set numerous times to validate the positioning of his data. That is the definitive source to compare against. Jim said that he did not have a passionate opposition to it, just that he would caution that if this is done, it is not going to have long term value. Larry clarified that what he is hearing is that in terms of the national database, there is no database development necessary, just developing ways of facilitating access to the current national database, as it relates to Nebraska points. If that is the case, then further development of this area may not be a priority and raised the question as to whether this database should be removed from the Priority Development Database List. The reason it is on here is because it is a national framework data set. That does not mean it can not be removed from the list. It is one of the seven database sets on the national list, having been identified by a large number of people as something they wanted. Jim cautioned that he was not advocating removing it from the list immediately. There might be applications he has not thought of yet.

Dayle asked if Jim was planning on looking more at this issue as he put his budget together. Jim said that with all the other issues and problems he was facing, this was not high enough on his priority list to make it into a budget review at any level. Dayle clarified that Jim's agency would be the one to address this. Jim said it would, although Roads would be an equal player. NGS is a partner in Roads with an ongoing program there and they have a budget line item for this type of thing.

Jerry Odum said that his agency receives fifteen to twenty requests a month, primarily for vertical control. They seldom get requests for horizontal control. However, because it has been made accessible on the web, he does not know for certain how many people are bypassing his office. Jim said that he would support making the federal data available to the public via the Internet. That would be a very low cost situation if a good search engine could be located to access that kind of data and make it available on the web. He does not believe that bringing in all the information of unknown quality or quantity that may be out there with power districts or whomever is of value. Places such as Lancaster County disseminate their information better than anyone else can.

Jim said that for vertical work this database is crucial because it is the only source of it and a lot of the people doing flood plane work require vertical information. However, he does not know a lot of people doing this other than NGS. Most of the work done by the power districts and counties is horizontal and not much vertical work is done that is not published in the data set already available.

Erik said he was a little unclear as to whether the idea was to put more responsibility on the county for developing this resource and determining when and where access is needed rather than the state being the originator/storer/creator. Jim agreed that was correct and felt it was appropriate. Lancaster County has its own system. Erik asked why Jim continued to reference Lancaster County. Jim explained that Lancaster County is the one county that disseminates more of that kind of information than any other that he can think of right away. Douglas County does have a set of coordinate values on their section corners and all the surveyors in that county are aware of it and know where to access it.

Erik said that when they started getting DOQ's and the '97 higher pixel resolution aerial photos he could see close to areas where some of these monuments were. He then checked them against the NGS monument database on top of that to do a validity check. When it came to creating their local projection and he was going from local to state plane to UTM, he would project the NGS database and inverse the coordinates to get back exactly what was on the data sheets. It was for Erik, a validity check as to how well the Lancaster set was being put together. Jim admitted that Erik was more aware of that sort of thing than he was and it was a use that he had not considered. Jim has been looking at this from the point of view of a geodetic surveyor and for the use of the monuments as opposed to a layer of the monuments for inclusion. Typically, inclusion of that layer does not control anything; it is an attachment layer. However, if it helps in creating GIS layers in databases as a validity check, then it is important.

Jim Langtry said that NGS monuments are monumented to a standard and are going to be stable. Other things that they put out could change tomorrow and he would rather people check in with the NGS database rather than his.

Larry clarified that what was being said was not an argument for enhancing the national database but one for improving accessibility. Erik asked that it be recognized as a priority database as well because it is an important, stable framework. Jim Brown said he could work with Jerry from NGS to explore this accessibility aspect. North and South Carolina have developed this data set and have densified it. They have software that retrieves this data set that comes from NGS. The NGS data set is a wonderful data set; the problem is retrieval software. Retrieval and storage of that data is not a problem for a GIS user. The problem is getting that data out there where a surveyor or a user on the ground can actually find the monument, know what the closest monument is to him, get a monument descriptor, etc. That is the difficult part.

Jim Langtry said that has been done in Lancaster County on their homepage. A user can look at a map and click on the monument and receive the NGS data. Jim Brown said that there was a real problem doing that on a statewide basis. Those descriptors do change. Jim Langtry said that when the data changes on the NGS data set, Lancaster County has the new information. They are directly tied to the original NGS database via the Internet. Erik said that unless you change the PID you do not have any problem. There is no trick to it because they are linked to the source. Jim Brown pointed out that Lancaster County had done so because they needed to, but there was no logic in the State of Nebraska creating an access to a federal database. Jim Langtry said that it is your reference control, so that things in Western Nebraska correlate with things in Eastern Nebraska. Jim Brown agreed but he does not see why the State of Nebraska or Lancaster County should develop the search engines and the database and have it available through their site. He feels it would be better to encourage NGS to make their data more accessible. Jerry Odum explained that the NGS data set is available via the Internet. Any new things that are posted are immediately available and can be accessed.

Larry clarified that the main consensus he was hearing is that this information needs enhanced accessibility. Larry asked if it was reasonable for Jim Brown and Jerry Odum to look at access issues. Jim Brown agreed.

- b. **Digital Orthoimagery** – The NRC, as the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Digital Orthoimagery database, made an interim report available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting (*completed initial assessment report is now available*). Mahendra Bansal reported that the NRC is developing the DOQ database in conjunction with the USGS. At this time, 75% of the state is completed with a resolution of one-meter gray scale. In the future, the NRC is looking at updating this database with color infrared (CIR). Anticipated completion of this database is June of 1999, which is on schedule.

Larry asked, with respect to color infrared enhancements, if the Steering Committee needed to be involved in terms of the NAPP photos. Mahendra agreed they did. The NAPP flights are tentatively scheduled for next year but likely to be bumped back a year or so. Dayle said that Darryl Williams from the USGS was present and could answer that question. Darryl said that the flights scheduled for this year had been moved to 1999.

Larry asked if those flights were going to be done in color as a matter of course or if a special request needed to be made. Darryl said that a request needed to be made. He asked if Larry had put the question of color to the Steering Committee. Larry said there had never been a detailed discussion of it, as the issue has not been raised before. Mahendra commented that was why he had mentioned that such an enhancement was in their future plans. Larry asked how soon the Committee needed to get back to Darryl relative to those questions. Darryl said the time had already passed in terms of contributions. If Nebraska wanted to do color, they would have to come up with some contribution or maybe the federal agent on the NAPP Steering Committee would have to look at that. Since this is a new request, Darryl will have to take it back and see where they are.

Dayle said that the NRC is going to look at both alternatives in their budget, both the gray scale update and the color infrared. The update with the new photos will be fairly easy to do because they already have the DEM's etc. Naturally the NRC would like to make the jump to color infrared, but such a move will be considerably more costly in terms of both money and time. A lot will depend on funding.

Larry asked if this was an issue that needed some discussion. Dayle agreed it was something that needed much more discussion. From his perspective, even if this is of great value to the state, it will take a lot of effort to get the money allocated. The NRC has been able to do the gray scale DOQ with existing funding and personnel by shifting duties. They are currently working with USGS on a work-share agreement and if they move to color, it

will no longer be a work-share. There will have to be a transfer of funds.

Darryl clarified that Dayle was discussing two different things. One is the acquisition of NAPP photography; the other is the work-share agreement to develop the DOQ. The DOQ was the work-share, the acquisition of NAPP photography was not. There was no state funding to acquire the NAPP photographs. Darryl does not know whether there will be funds required for color infrared photographs. It may happen the same way as the black and white photographs. The limiting factor is where Nebraska is in the queue as far as federal priorities. Some states do not contribute to NAPP and still get priority. Contributions to NAPP only buy priority for that year. In earlier discussions, there seemed to be no urgency or need in Nebraska to get next generation mapping, as NRC was looking into lower flying options.

Larry asked if Darryl could get some sense of what it would take financially to get the state to bump up from black and white to color, it would be useful to the Steering Committee. In addition, the Steering Committee needs to start over in terms of a discussion of the priority of that, because there has been no discussion of black and white versus color. Larry asked if Dayle was realistically planning on doing anything in this coming year's budget cycle about this. Dayle said that since they are going to be completing this project in the middle of the biennium, a proposal will need to be included as to when they will update. Larry wanted to know if the Steering Committee needed to discuss the color issue at the next meeting. Dayle said he would have a budget submitted before then. Larry pointed out that it was going to come back to the Steering Committee.

Darryl Williams said that assuming the Committee was interested in moving to color and was willing to pay, the flying season would be in the February to mid-April of 1999. The deliverable product would not be available until after June so payment would not be necessary until after that time. Dayle said that the money is not available to do cost sharing to upgrade. The NRC may have to look at renewing the gray scale if those are still available free of charge from the USGS or look to the federal agencies to see if they are willing to pay for the upgrade to color this time around.

Mark Kuzila asked what good color infrared was during the leaf off-season. Mahendra said that because an update was needed anyway, updating to color infrared made sense. Jim Brown asked who the principle players to benefit from infrared would be. Dayle said the NRC, the NRCS, and FSA would all benefit from color infrared. Mark said that infrared was important when you want to see vegetation. A lot of things can be seen with color infrared, such as soils and wetlands. In soil survey, they do not want leaves on, but if color infrared is desired, it should be done during high vegetation period. Dayle added that flood plane management does not use leaf on either.

Larry concluded that there are so many questions and so much money involved in this issue that it did not seem feasible for the Steering Committee to deal with it in the short time period available. Jim Brown said that if this is something that the Committee determines is a high priority item, there is the option of going to the Legislature for emergency appropriations. Larry pointed out that the next question becomes what about the NAPP flight timeline. They are on a five-year cycle now. A decision needs to be made whether to reschedule the black and white flight or to do it in addition to the color infrared.

Jim Brown said that there are additional players who have not been considered yet. The counties are doing their own lower level photography because the elevations of the NAPP photographs are simply not adequate for cadastral tax maps. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent by local governments for low-level flights. Somewhere around five to ten counties are commissioning private consultants to fly every year. That money needs to be identified. Something may be worked out for a lower level flight with them.

Jim Brown acknowledged that this is a topic that might require several meetings to identify all the players and relevant details. Larry clarified that this is an area with enough players, money and usage to get an interagency study group together to look at future continuance and enhancements of the DOQ's. Mahendra agreed that a subcommittee could be created to look into the second generation of DOQ's. Jim Langtry said they just flew 250 square miles at one-foot resolution last year.

Lash pointed out that if a fifteen or twenty more counties decide they no longer want to do tax assessment, then

this becomes a much more critical question.

Dayle said that in the agency technology plan, this type of thing needed to be discussed. Jim Brown said that there were a variety of needs with respect to this issue. Some need color infrared, some need lower elevations and all of them bring money and needs to the table. Larry suggested that given these issues were raised so late in the budget planning cycle, it didn't seem very practical that could be addressed in planning for the current budget cycle. Larry suggested that the most productive step might be to do some further work to flesh out the issues and get an intergovernmental study group together to look at the issues. Dayle cautioned that if it is not addressed for this budget cycle, then it will be six years before it could be brought up again.

Jim Brown suggested that the first step that can be done in the next two months is to determine how much money is currently being spent out at the county level for aerial photography. Larry agreed that if the Committee wants the counties to be players, then the Committee needs to figure out a way to involve them. Jim Langtry pointed out that they might not be interested in funding lower resolution photography. One approach would be to get an agreement with the local communities who are doing the higher resolution to provide those to the NRC or state agencies. That would allow the NRC to update those areas at least.

Larry asked what the course of action on this was to be. He proposed further development of the issues and identifying the parties. Dayle said that the agency technology plans that are going to come in will be addressing the needs of each individual agency. One of the major barriers is getting more people in the state government to understand what the future is like and what will be needed. LB924 is a part of this. Before, agencies had to go in and present their requests to the Legislature without a clear understanding of what the issues really were.

Larry expressed concern that the Steering Committee will not be in a good position to respond to a budget proposal from the NRC without doing more in depth research. Jim Brown clarified that what Dayle had said was that the NRC was mainly planning on rebuilding the DOQ's on the gray scale. Dayle explained that they would be looking at three different options. The most likely one is to do rebuilding on the gray scale. Another option is doing some lower level flights in specific areas for more detailed flood plane management. Finally, color infrared. For the last option, they need to look into the validity of non-leaf times. Jim Brown said that the Committee would just have to do the best they could with it. Dayle said that they would be detailing the pros and cons of each option in their technology plan, along with performance goals.

Larry asked if anyone had any ideas on how to better prepare the Steering Committee to address this issue coming up in two months. Dayle said that they are looking at the people who are working on this and Mahendra is working on further fleshing out some of the questions on this issue in the initial assessment.

- c. **Elevation Data.** The NRC, as the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Elevation Database, made an interim initial assessment report available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting (*completed initial assessment report is now available*). Mahendra said that the NRC is building a DEM database in conjunction with USGS. At this time, 80% of the state is completed and they are planning on being finished by the end of this year. Those DEMs are level two, 1:24,000, 10-foot control interval. Revisions of the DEMs are half of that or five feet. What the NRC is looking into for the next generation is from some 5,000-foot lower level flights, DEM's at a two-foot interval for selected areas.

Larry asked if there was some process in place for other agencies that have need for this data to access it. Mahendra said that this information was available on the Internet. Larry acknowledged that there was access to existing data, but asked if there a way for agencies who might need greater resolution on elevation data to pool information on their needs. Mahendra responded that FEMA has it and that is how the NRC works with them.

Larry asked if this was an area that needed to be addressed, to see if there was a way to find out what those needs are. The main players would be mainly communities and NRDs. Dayle added three other federal agencies, including FEMA. Flood plane management needs to be accelerated. It was a mission bestowed by the Legislature many years ago and has never been adequately funded. The NRC has found some ways to take some shortcuts, which has really moved them ahead.

- d. **Hydrology.** The NRC, as the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Hydrologic database, made an interim initial report available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting (*completed initial assessment report is now available*). Mahendra said that they have the statewide hydrologic unit watershed data, which is elevated at 1:24,000 topographical units. The hydrology database is available statewide. They will refine and update that database after the DOQ database has been completed.

Larry noted that there is a national effort to develop standards on the 1:24,000 scale. He asked if the NRC was looking at attempting to comply with those standards. Mahendra said he discussed it with Dayle and that they will be developing the hydrographic database based on a 1:12,000 scale using the DOQ's. Larry said that the national effort was utilizing the EPA river reach codes. Mahendra clarified that they would not be transferring those, but rather the spatial data on a 1:24,000 scale, the ones that have been developed from topographic maps. There is more evolution than the 1:100,000 by the EPA and USGS.

Larry said that his understanding is that the river reach codes are scale independent, the idea being that they are not at spatial resolution, it is the networking of the rivers. Those are being presented as a nation data set attribute for multiple agencies. Hopefully, as this work proceeds, all the agencies having an interest in this data set will have a vehicle for them to come together and talk about their joint needs. There is a standards process in development around this data set, but the EPA river reach codes have been fairly well agreed upon for this 1:24,000.

Mahendra said that the NRC plans to select one test county and wait for test data as Kansas is doing. It has not been done yet. They will look into the river reach codes and other potential national standards when they get into working on the test county.

Larry asked if it would be possible to get together an intergovernmental/interagency body to look at everyone's needs. Larry suggested that if there is a database that has a real cross-section of interests, it is the hydrological database. Mahendra suggested a single subcommittee be created for the four databases covered by the NRC. Dayle said he was not up to speed on the EPA hydrology standards requests. In line with the President's clean water action plan, nationwide the state EPA's and state Conservationists have been asked to outline the eight digit hydrologic units in each state and provide it to the federal EPA by August 1. That work is underway in Nebraska. Dayle has been on that national team and no one has ever said anything about the EPA. It has been all about the eight digit units utilized with USGS. Dayle said that Nebraska wanted to go to a higher resolution but were told eight digits was enough. He asked for Darryl and Dennis's comments on this area.

Darryl Williams the current national hydrology data set is basically a combination of USGS's spatial data on the 1/100,000 scale map and the EPA's reach codes. The EPA took the 1/100,000 scale data and put their reach code and all their information on it. A lot of states are moving from the 1/100,000 scale and are developing 1/24,000-scale statewide hydro-databases. They are asking anyone in the state who is trying to develop statewide hydro-databases to incorporate the specifications from the 1/100,000 scale. The primary specification is the EPA river reach code. If you come up with 24k scale spreadsheets and take and replace the 100k attributes with the 24k features, you get more features but the reach codes do not change. The bigger states are adding their own attributes at the higher resolution. There are no specific set standards nationwide at the 1/24,000 scale but there are standards at the 1/100,000 scale that will be carried over. Darryl requested that when Nebraska does develop their hydrology database that they consider incorporating these national specifications.

Larry asked if the USGS was open to providing the vectors from the scanned separates for the hydrology in the 1/24,000 scale. Darryl said that is what they are talking about with Missouri as a sort of partnership. These data sets are not being distributed in quadrangle or tile formats. The distribution product is planned to be the eight digit-cataloging unit. At the 1/100,000 scale it will already be edited and attributed in 100k tiles. The software needs to be located to stitch the two together and cut out the cataloging units. That will be the distribution product. The tools to do the stitching and cataloging are just now coming out. They are about a year behind in this. It was supposed to be available in October of last year. There is one pilot catalog being worked on rather intensely by the EPA and USGS. They are planning on using this as an example prior to the other data coming out. When the move is made to the 24k scale, there is a lot of discussion and differences

between the states as to what the final product will look like, attribution-wise. Mahendra commented that is why they are planning to do a test county.

Larry expressed concerns about the practicality of one subcommittee being responsible for all four of the priority databases (DOQs, Elevation, Hydrology, and Soils). There seems to be a lot of issues to be discussed for one body. Mahendra that there are a lot of different players, but if you look at them closely, the many of the players are the same, Geological Survey, NRCS, CSD, NEMA, FEMA. There are a lot of state agencies. If one subcommittee is formed, all the items can be discussed at the same time. Dennis said that he would rather attend one meeting rather than three meetings when he is only concerned about the river region or hydrology. Dennis also noted that the Department of Environmental Quality is taking the lead on trying to get the reach data clarified and cleaned up.

Larry agreed in terms of having too many meetings, but it seems that, in terms of a hydrology database study, there is already an overwhelming agenda without bringing in issues related to other databases. Mahendra said he would look into that.

- e. **Soils** – The NRC, as the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Soils database, made an interim initial report available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting (completed initial assessment report is now available). The SSURGO soils database is being done in cooperation with the NRCS, CSD, and NRC. There is a schedule prepared and the soils are already compiled and digitized to meet standards. There is a plan scheduled for 1999. Fourteen are completed. Mark Kuzila said that several are SSURGO certified. Dayle added that Pawnee county just got certified in the last week and it is going to start moving really fast pretty soon. Mahendra projected that the whole state will be completed within five years. They are looking into ways to expedite that process.

Dayle said that the NRC has looked at this database because they have had the Republican Basin people coming to them due to lawsuits in Kansas and the Governance Committee coming to them because of their work in Colorado and Nebraska asking them to really accelerate the development of the SSURGO digital coverage. It would be a difficult thing to do both money-wise and personnel-wise. As the state soil scientist described it, the gestation of an elephant is twenty months, but if you get twenty-two elephants together you cannot do it in one month. The information is needed a lot sooner, but it cannot be obtained any sooner. Dayle commended Mark Kuzila and the NRCS. One major problem has been getting these approved nationally because they were not ready to do it. However, it has been decentralized and the databases no longer have to all go through Fort Worth for review.

Larry asked if a rough written plan had been developed and if so, if it could be shared with the Steering Committee. Dayle said there was a plan. Mahendra agreed to prepare one. Mark commented that several years ago there was a written plan. The discussion indicated that a plan is pretty well developed and it can be provided. The DOQQs are being used as the base map and they are starting in the southeast corner of the state and moving towards the western corner of the state. Mark asked Dayle if there was another area of great priority such as the Platte. Dayle said he already mentioned both the Republican and the Platte. There are 12 counties in the Platte corridor that they need to accelerate. This is something that needs to be put into the NRC's budget request so that the political leaders know about it. There are heavy demands on resource management.

- f. **Transportation** – The DOR was the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Transportation database and a report was made available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Ed Kelley reported that the list of stakeholders in the report is not necessarily a complete list. The federal, state and local agencies were listed along with regional agencies such as StarTran and Metro Area Transit and other public transportation systems. Public Utilities were OPPD, LES, and NPPD. The private companies list is probably the most incomplete, commercial traffic on the highway system, engineering, mapping, surveying firms.

The jewel of the Roads database is the 10,000 miles of digitized state maintained roadway systems in the state and an additional 20,000 miles of local road systems consisting mainly of major arterials. An additional 70,000

miles of county roads are not yet integrated into the state's digital roadway database and exist only on local systems, if at all.

There are a few other perceived needs. Other linear features, such as railroads, trails, bus lines and airports need to be included and there is a need for a database set for polygon features, such as wetlands, potential properties, right-of-way and other considerations. Deficiencies in the current system include degree of accessibility, differences in scale and projection, and consistency of information provided.

The recommended list for a study group was drawn from the list of stakeholders. This included City Planning Departments, County Highway Departments, State Patrol Game and Parks Commission, Natural Resource Districts, Federal Highway Administration, local E-911 systems and various internal divisions within the Nebraska Department of Roads, such as bridge and right-of-way etc.

It would be useful to ensure consistent standards exist, primarily in the areas of scale, projection and various other applications. In terms of outstanding maintenance or integration needs, if NDOR is to be a repository of transportation data in Nebraska, then integration between state and local data processes needs to be reviewed. A rough timeline to achieve the study objections is at least three to four months.

Dick Genrich commented that NDOR is going to take care of the 10,000 miles of state maintained roads, and even the 20,000 miles of local roads. There is a lot of additional information out there in the form of private files such as the Tiger files and lots of other commercial sources which could be brought into a transportation database. However, there is always the problem of scale and accuracy. Dick did get approval from his department heads to do a quick survey of cities and counties to see what, if any, databases have been created through the E-911 process. There are a lot of consultants out there working but he does not know how they are doing this. This will get things started towards figuring out exactly where Nebraska is in terms of a Transportation database.

Lash Chaffin requested a call before Dick sends his survey out on the E-911 stuff. Lash noted that it is a whole different set of players, a lot of fire departments instead of city planning departments. It took the League a couple of years to figure out who the players really were because it is not the same people they usually deal with. The street commissioners that Dick usually works with may not have any idea what is going on at the fire department two blocks away because these groups do not talk to one another.

Larry said that the information from the Framework Data Survey would be very helpful in this project, but he is unlikely to get that information back for about four months. Dick acknowledged that he may not receive much of a response back from a survey, but it is worth a try.

Jim added that there is another set of players coming into this, the city or county utilities and roads crews. He is seeing a fairly constant flow of people doing facilities mapping on GPS. They are going out and GPSing their bridges and signs to do a facility inventory. Some of the stuff they are doing is probably really good, down to a three-foot accuracy. A lot of these people are venturing out on their own. There is a lot of work going on in Dawson County, some in Hall County, some in Grand Island and some in Adams County. He is seeing a constant trickle of this stuff and he believes there is about to be a flood. They are finding out how cheap and economically they can map their facilities and they may wind up mapping a lot of the things Roads needs for their transportation layer.

Larry added that one of the major deficiencies is a way to capture and integrate this local work that is happening. Hopefully, as they are doing this local work, they are following some sort of standards so that it can be integrated with a larger data set. The really big need out there is a way to discover and integrate, on an ongoing basis, the work that is going on. Dick commented that it has been this way for years, as Lash suggested, that these different agencies and people do not talk to one another. It is a big problem but maybe this will get them thinking about sharing and pooling data and resources.

Dick said that he and Larry have been invited down to Kansas in August to meet with a gentleman from BTS. He is working for them to put together the draft road data model. In the way of standards, Dick believes this is

some of the direction that they will be going.

Dayle commented that the County Emergency Management is fairly heavily involved in the E-911 work. They used to be called Civil Defense Directors but in the state they are called NEMA. Lash said that in Campbell, Nebraska they GPSed a lot of stuff last summer. They have better data than the County Assessor.

Larry concluded that there are two major issues, what is out there, and standards, so that when it is developed, integration will be easier. On the standards side, Darryl said that there is a parallel effort underway right now. They are not referring to it as the national transportation data set because it is still in the conceptual phase, but that is an ongoing activity. There is a group of people at the mapping center working to find out what kind of features the transportation community needs in a national transportation data set. They will have a national transportation data set that would include the roads, railroads, airports etc. and then they will refer to something like the highways as a subset of the national roads data set. The people who are working on this have made several trips to the state of Georgia because they are doing a national hydro data set and a statewide transportation at the same time. Right now, they are trying to find out from the DOTs and other transportation users in the state what features should go into a national data set. USGS is trying to determine what role they should play in this, if any.

Larry said that he felt if any issue is ripe for moving forward with a study group, the Transportation database seems to be it. Larry asked if Dick had general approval to put some energy into doing this. Dick said that he did have approval but he wants to confirm that. Larry said that the Steering Committee might want to wait to adopt a formal motion until some word polishing can be done, but unless there are objections, then it would be good to urge the Department of Roads to move forward with an intergovernmental study group. Dick wanted to add utilities to the list of primary stakeholders to be included in the study group.

Dayle moved to accept recommendation 3b, which reads, 'A core working group could be made up of the following primary stakeholders: City Planning Departments, County Highway Departments, State Patrol, Game and Parks Commission, Natural Resource Districts, Federal Highway Administration, local E-911 systems, and various internal divisions within the NDOR.' Val Goodman seconded the motion.

Dick asked if any other groups should be included. Dayle asked that the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency be included because they are very interested in the E-911 system. Lash agreed that the emergency managers should be included. Larry commented that another area of standards that is likely to come up within this area of study is going to be addresses because that is very closely tied to streets.

Larry asked if a refined resolution needed to be prepared for action at the next meeting. Dayle did not think it would be useful to wait that long. Larry called the roll and the motion passed (see vote #6).

- g. **Governmental Units Databases.** – Legislative Computer Services was the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Governmental Units database and a report was made available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Val Goodman said that when he began looking at this issue, he called to ask Larry which governmental units the Committee was interested in focusing on, but Larry did not have a simple answer. Val listed some of the governmental units he reviewed or discussed with others. After a preliminary review, he determined that the primary stakeholders as county and local governments, a lot of the universities, several state and public agencies, federal agencies, all the regional or planning agencies, non-profit organizations, private corporations, political parties and a lot of individuals.

On a national level, most of the applications were based on a demographic analysis, geocoding, address matching and those sorts of things. A lot is done on political issues from national lobbyists all the way down to local lobbyists. Most of the databases that are developed within the Legislature are using the Tiger lines. One of the major problems is accuracy of the Tiger lines.

One governmental unit that Val would like to see developed which they will be working on would be the voting precincts or wards. They will be working with the census bureau in late November/December. They will be contacting all the local and county officials, mostly election commissioners and asking them to send their

maps. Last time they requested these maps, three or four maps were digital but most of the ones that came in were paper. Some of the county boundaries are the voter precinct boundaries.

With respect to the maintenance of these, redistricting is done every ten years. Many districts remain the same for ten years and then are updated. The voting precincts are based on population and are updated as population changes. At the small local government level, he thinks those would change based on redistricting of population.

A study would take four to six months.

Larry asked if Val had discussed with his supervisors whether or not they would be open to him putting some time and energy into this project. Val said he had asked the Research Division and they have not gotten back to him yet. They have the budget in place to create the voting precincts because that is a program within redistricting. Senatorial staff would need to be included in something like this and there has been too much turnover in staff lately.

Larry said that it appears that several databases on Val's list have already been compiled and need only some documentation of what the process is to collect this information and where to locate it. There are others, such as city, school districts, and municipal boundaries, which do not seem to have an ongoing process in place for updating that information.

Lash commented that the counties should have that because the cities have to file that. Val said that the only two cities that send him municipal boundary updates periodically are Lincoln and Bellevue. Lash asked if there was any opportunity to overlap this with what the Bureau of Census is going to do next year. Dick said that as part of the redistribution of the gasoline tax the cities are required to provide the NDOR with their corporate limits or any additions to their corporate limits. They are in the process of putting the new corporate limits up on their maps as they come in, but they are not digital yet.

Jim Brown observed that there are actually two types of political districts. There are the districts having to do with taxation and taxation issues such as school districts, fire districts, natural resource districts. That problem will solve itself, as the counties are able to put their parcel units together. Each parcel unit has identifiers listing which taxation districts are in it. That includes corporate limits. The ones that cannot be covered are the election districts. Inevitably, those will have to be actively generated because they will not come in any other way.

Val noted that the hope is that all redistricting are going to follow physical features such as roads and rivers and such. Another goal is to pass a law that states that all voting precincts follow some physical feature. It is very difficult to explain when the districts or corporate limits move and there is no visible line to show that it moved. Jim Brown added that there are some places where the corporate limits go through the middle of a property so that one half is taxed at corporate rates and one portion is taxed outside of corporate limits. However, when it comes in on a taxation file, it looks like two properties. At some point, when Lancaster County finishes with its assessment, then those things will be mapped and Lincoln's corporate limits will be well mapped along with school districts, fire district limits, and natural resource limits. There is no way to get ahead of that process. The bigger question is how to get the voting districts and other regulatory districts in which are not maintained anywhere.

Larry asked if it was possible to get ahead of the curve to some extent through processes like what Dick talked about where counties are informing Roads about their boundaries. If that information could be captured in some systematic way, that would allow the Committee to get ahead of that process. Dick said that he really had no control over what information he received from them.

Lash asked if information was requested in the road plans. Dick agreed and said that most of them do a reasonable job of providing that information, particularly with the division of the gas tax. However, he is not certain he is getting really accurate information. Lash added that not all of the direct allocation was going to the villages. Information on cities below five hundred is missing. Dick did not think those limits changed all that

much anyway. Lash asked how low Val is looking to go. Some of those cities with second class voting precincts realistically could not follow geographical features and come up quadrants. Val said that they are not involved in the creation of those districts.

Larry asked if it was feasible to form a committee and determine which ones already have a process in place and prioritize the remainder. Larry recommended that the ones needing prioritization would be municipal and school districts. Val said that the school districts were already done. Larry said that at least getting the data documented would be a step forward. Now, if someone wants the data, they do not know where to find it. A committee needs to be formed to work on at least some of these issues.

Lash suggested getting the Secretary of State's office involved.

Lash brought up the obscure governmental units, such as zoning jurisdictions. On planning commissions, technically there are representatives who are not from the corporate limits. Lash said that there are some of them that have multiple planning units. They have taken a mile for zoning but only a half-mile for code enforcement and a quarter of a mile for nuisance enforcement. Dick commented that some of those counties have an urban limit that is totally different from everything else. Lash added that with the electric service territory, things became really complicated.

Jim Brown agreed that putting together a committee to figure out where these things are stored is a good idea, although somewhat ambitious. In the case of political districts, just grasping the size of the problem is the first issue. Dayle said Val had a good recommendation under 3b.

Val moved that the Steering Committee create a study committee to define the use of the governmental units data that is available, where it is available and the process that is in place to develop and maintain the data. Jim Langtry seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #7*).

- h. **Public Land Survey Database.** – The State Surveyors Office was the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Public Lands Survey System database and a report was made available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Jim Brown said that throughout his assessment, he referred back to the PLS pilot project. They are moving into the second county on this project. Most of the issues dealing with the PLS Survey Database are being addressed by the pilot project. Jim believes it is premature to form a study group. They are discussing accuracy issues currently. They are having some problems meeting the accuracy Erik's group has targeted. In a few more meetings, they should know a lot more about this database and have some knowledgeable questions to ask. He would like to wait on creating a study group for this. Jim does have a new person on staff to assist in working with this. LB924 directly addressed the PLS and it is the only issue being funded.
- i. **Land Cover/Land Use.** – The Conservation and Survey Division - UNL was the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Land Cover/Land Use databases and a report was made available on the Internet prior to the Steering Committee meeting. Larry indicated that the report from Jim Merchant was available in the agenda packet. Larry said he could read it, or the Committee could read it themselves. Given the lateness of the hour, Larry suggested that this issue be deferred until the next meeting when Jim is available to discuss it. Dayle asked that the Farm Service Agency should be added to the list of primary stakeholders and should be included in the proposed study subcommittee. Larry added that they had just called him to express interest in the federal representative position. Dayle added that on page 5 of 6 he had a correction. There is only the Lower Platte Alliance, singular, and there is the Platte River Governance Committee. Dayle also thought that Central Nebraska NPPD should be included as well. They are very involved in irrigation, land cover, habitat protection etc.
- j. **Property Parcels.** – The Property Tax Division was the agency responsible for compiling an initial assessment of the Property Parcels database. There was no one from that agency at the meeting and there was no report.

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE: Lash reported that the Education Subcommittee met a couple of times last

month and had some productive meetings. They discussed that there is a wide range of groupings of people interested in GIS. There has been some education going on that has been taking place on a couple of levels. Jim Merchant and his staff, Dayle's staff, Dick Genrich and Jon Ogden have been real helpful at educating people in a variety of forums about the very basics of what GIS can do for local government. There have also been a lot of educational efforts taking place on a very sophisticated level, such as the symposium. In between, there is a growing gap. There has been a lot of interest in the real basics and there is a high level group of GIS users. Duane Stott, Jim Lacey, and Jim Merchant's staff has put in a lot of time into education. Primarily, these educators have been people who have other jobs. These resources have been over-utilized.

The discussion kept coming back around to the fact that last year the Committee had asked for some staffing for educational and technical assistance purposes. The Committee apparently did not communicate to the right people the need and potential benefits for this type of education at this particular time in history, as the request was not funded. What the Education Committee is recommending is that the Steering Committee ask for the same kind of funding for educational purposes again. Lash explained that they decided on the figure of \$70,000 for funding a staff person and \$40,000 for education and outreach program funding.

Jim Brown said that last fall this request was an attachment to LB924. It ultimately was not included in LB924. This year the only way to get the funds appropriated is to go through the budget proposal process. If the Steering Committee is going to ask for this level of funding, the members need to be prepared to go before the Appropriations Committee and testify for why this money is needed. Jim cautioned the Committee to be aware that even if they approve this recommendation, it is not just going to happen. Lash said that part of the burden of proof needs to fall on the shoulders of the beneficiaries of the training. He is guessing that local government is going to need the bulk of the training.

Val asked if this was the University's call to reach out and teach. Lash said he thought that Jim Merchant would love for that to happen. However, Lash indicated that Jim reported that the University Nebraska really does not have GIS expertise in a lot of areas. It is a tool for the geography people, the natural resource people, and a lot of other disciplines, but it is not a specific discipline. Larry said that he felt that overall GIS training and support needs would be best served if the University were to develop a GIS technical services center, but he does not see it happening in the short term. It would make sense because of their mission; they could provide training, outreach and ongoing technical assistance.

Jim asked for a motion to accept the Education Committee's report.

Lash moved to accept this Committee's report and to endorse efforts to obtain the recommended additional funding in the upcoming budget cycle. Jim Langtry seconded. The motion passed (see vote #8).

Subcommittee Expenses Reimbursement. Dayle suggested that this was a good time in the agenda to return to the issue of providing reimbursement to the members of the Advisory Committee on Standards. Dayle moved that for the remainder of 1998 the Steering Committee provide funds for mileage and out of pocket expenses for the subcommittees. Dick Genrich seconded the motion. Larry pointed out for the record that this motion will directly compete with the funds available for use on the symposium. Dayle acknowledged that, but with all the work they are doing, they deserve some assistance with expenses. He added that he hopes that if the members do not need the money they will volunteer their mileage and expenses.

The motion passed (see vote #9).

1999 Nebraska GIS Symposium/Nebraska GIS/LIS Association Planning Committee – Larry reported that the committee met and interest was expressed by those attending to proceed with this organizing effort. The meeting report is in the agenda packet and also on the web. Essentially, the committee is still exploring the possibilities of forming an association. Jim Brown was instructed to form a committee at the last meeting. He formed an initial committee consisting of Scott Richert from Lancaster County, Ed Kelley from Roads, Jim Langtry from Lancaster County, and Jim Lacey from Conservation and Survey Division.

The committee adopted an interim name of Nebraska GIS/LIS Association Planning Committee. They decided to meet

the first Thursday of each month to continue exploring this. They determined that they would spend the first hour of the meeting talking about association formation and the second hour talking about the symposium. Jim Merchant is very concerned about signing the contract with the Cornhusker until he determines that there is enough energy available to make the symposium happen.

Larry passed around a sign up sheet. Interested individuals are encouraged to let the committee know if they are interested in helping to make the symposium a successful event. If anyone is interested in working on the Symposium or in making the Association work, please attend the monthly meetings.

FDGC Meeting. Jim Brown stated the notes had been handed out on that and the Committee members could read about that by themselves.

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS UPDATES ON THEIR AGENCY GIS ACTIVITIES – Jim Brown dispensed with the updates. Dayle passed out copies of the latest DOQQ report.

OTHER BUSINESS – Dayle provided a brief report on the Platte River Joint Study and the Platte River Feasibility Study. The Lower Platte Alliance (from Columbus on down to the Missouri) and the Hydrology Study that is taking place with five NRDs and with a number of state agencies involved, need quite a bit of additional GIS coverage. The NRC has entered into a contract with them to develop some of these coverages. It is a three-way contract, signed by the Hydrology Study Group last week. It has already been executed. Those two entities are providing equipment and two staff people for the NRC to develop those GIS coverages that they need. Within the next two months, Dayle anticipates they will have their two staff people on. The NRC will be adding three more ArcInfo seats bringing their total number up to twelve. The main reason they wanted to talk to the GIS Steering Committee is because there is some concern about the equipment purchased. Basically this is just an information update. Jim asked Dayle to put an update together for the next meeting as to what the data sets are and what coverages they are to develop.

Larry said that he received a call from Larry Wells who is involved with the Tri-state Cooperative Agreement on the Platte River. Dayle clarified that Larry Wells is a farmer and is a member of the Governance Committee. Wells informed Larry Zink that as a part of the three state cooperative agreement, they are developing a GIS protocol manual which will outline the data requirements for all the various parties as part of this Platte River Cooperative Study. Larry Wells wanted to let the Committee know that this process is going on. If any members are interested, Larry Wells has a draft copy. There are quarterly meetings in Denver. Dayle attends those meetings and he told Larry Wells that as soon as he had a copy of the manual, the GIS Steering Committee would like to see it. If there is any interest, Larry Zink requested that Committee members let himself or Dayle know.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be **Thursday, October 1, 1998 at 9:30 am.**

Vote Tallies for July 23, 1998, GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting										
	Roll call	Min. #1	Stds. Adv. Cmte. #2	Bdgt. Review #3	Oper. Bdgt. #4	Nebr. Forum #5	Transp. Study #6	Gov. Unit Study #7	Educ. Bdgt. #8	Cmte. Exp. #9
DAS - Rick Becker	A
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
CSD - Jim Merchant Les Howard	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NGPC - Bruce Sackett Mele Koneya	A
NRC - Dayle Williamson	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PRO - Yvonne Norton- Leung	A
PTD - Cathy Lang	A
DOR - Dick Genrich Jon Ogden	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
St. Surv - Jim Brown	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LRD - Val Goodman	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NV	+
Federal Rep.
John Miyoshi	A
Blaine Dinwiddie Steve Larson	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cliff Welsh	A
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lash Chaffin	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dennis Wilson	A
TOTALS	10 - P	10 - +	10 - +	10 - +	10 - +	10 - +	10 - +	10 - +	9 - + 1 - NV	10 - +

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