

## GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes - 9/21/94

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by the Jim Brown, acting as Chair in the absence of both Chair Rod Armstrong and Vice Chair Lash Chaffin. Rod A. arrived later in the meeting and assumed the duties of the Chair.

Present were (\* authorized to vote):

* Rod Armstrong	Governor's Policy Research Office
* Mahendra Bansal	Natural Resources Commission
* Jim Brown	State Surveyor's Office
* Dennis Burling	Department of Environmental Quality
* Blaine Dinwiddie	Omaha Public Power District
Val Goodman	Legislative Research Division
* Jim Merchant	Conservation and Survey Division
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
* Dennis Wilson	City of Omaha
* Larry Worrell	Lancaster County Surveyor
Larry K. Zink	Coordinator, GIS Steering Cmte.

**NOTICE OF MEETING.** A public notice of the meeting pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R.S. 1943, was published in the Omaha World Herald on Sept. 14, 1994.

**ROLL CALL.** Acting Chair Jim Brown requested that Larry Z. call the roll. Eight duly authorized representatives were present and therefore a quorum was present to conduct business. Both Rod A. and Jon O. arrived later during the meeting.

**MINUTES.** Dennis W. moved, Blaine D. seconded, that the minutes of the August 12, 1994 Steering Committee meeting be approved as circulated. Jim B. called for a voice vote, which was unanimous.

**DATA INVENTORY SUBCMTE.** In the absence of the Data Inventory Chair, Jon O., Larry Z. lead the Str. Cmte. in reviewing the current status of the agency submissions of metadata to Steve Jonas of the Nebraska Library Commission to be included on the Online Data Catalog. Larry W. indicated that Lancaster County would list no coverages until they have made more progress in checking and completing their coverages. Jim B. indicated that the State Surveyor's Office has no coverages. Mahendra B. indicated that NRC should have all their data listed by the end of a couple months. Dennis W. indicated that if he had Steve Jonas' address the City of Omaha could list a number of coverages. Duane S. indicated that he also could and would list the coverages that they have developed for Scotts Bluff County. Blaine D. also indicated that he needed Steve Jonas' address and then OPPD could list a number of coverages which they have available. Paul Yamamoto indicated that DEQ had most of their coverages listed. Jim M. indicated that he needed to talk with Les Howard about the status of CSD's coverages.

Issues which surfaced during this review included a concern about how a statewide coverage should be listed on the Online Catalog, i.e. does it need to be listed 93 times for each county. The Pilot Project Team was urged to address this question. Concern was also expressed regarding how coverages should be listed on the Online Catalog which are currently held by an agency, but not developed by them, i.e. the STATSGO soil data. The Data Inventory Pilot Project Team was asked to consider and make recommendations on both of these matters. When Jon O. arrived at the meeting, the matters of developing recommendations for a System Maintenance Plan and procedures for maintenance of the collected data on the Online Catalog system were also referred to the Pilot Project Team.

**POLICY SUBCMTE.** In the absence of the Policy Subcmte. Chair Rod A., Larry Z. reviewed the recommendations of the Policy Subcmte. relative to data development priorities. These had been mailed out with the agenda.

General Policy Statement on Data Development. Jim M. moved, Duane S. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. adopt the two paragraphs relating to a general policy on Str. Cmte. data development.

The GIS Steering Committee will encourage and support efforts by state, federal and local agencies and organizations to develop needed GIS databases and coverages which would be available to other agencies and organizations on a non-profit basis. The development of databases and coverages which have a statewide scope will be a priority for the GIS Steering Committee.

As part of all GIS database and coverage development efforts, the Steering Committee urges the developing agencies and organizations to communicate with potential second and third party users of the data to determine ways in which their data needs, and potential data development resources, could be integrated into the data development effort. The GIS Steering Committee will seek to facilitate such communication efforts.

The discussion which followed clarified that this policy was intended to relate to how the Str. Cmte. would allocate its promotion efforts and not to negating an agency's data development initiatives which did not match with this policy. The discussion also clarified that the reference to non-profit was not intended to set a general policy on the pricing of data. The motion passed with a vote of seven, with one member present, but not voting (see attached Voting Record sheet, vote #2).

Data Development Priorities. The Str. Cmte. next addressed the Data Development priorities suggested by the Subcmte. Following discussion and minor modifications of the suggested categories, Larry W. moved, Dennis W. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. adopt the following general categories as data development priorities:

- DOQQs (Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quads),
- Multi-purpose Cadastrals (i.e. tax and parcel mapping, and land ownership),
- Land Cover/Land Use,
- Soils,
- Transportation Facilities, and
- Waterways and Waterbodies.

The motion passed unanimously (see the attached Voting Record sheet, vote #3).

Boundary Data Enhancement. Jim B. discussed with the Str. Cmte. the unique problems related to gaining and maintaining accurate boundary data. Jim B. laid out the elements of a medium-to-long-term approach to addressing these boundary data problems and asked for the Str. Cmte.'s feedback, relative to their likely support for such an effort. These elements included:

- a long-term effort to increase the number and distribution of available, registered state planes survey reference marks;
- the establishment of a central registry of these marks; and
- an effort to require that original government corners and major survey points (within a specified distance of a survey reference mark) be tied to state plane reference.

The feedback the Str. Cmte. gave Jim B. was one of general support for such an approach and urged him to proceed to further develop proposals in this regard.

**TECHNICAL STANDARDS SUBCMTE.** No report.

**EDUCATION SUBCMTE.** Jim M. noted that the first GIS Forum of the season had been held on this day and that there was an approx. attendance of 75 people from diverse disciplines and interests. Jim M. also noted that the deadline for the next newsletter was mid-October. Duane S. shared with the Str. Cmte. that by next June Scotts Bluff County should have reached a milestone in their GIS implementation, in that they will have most of their originally targeted coverages developed. Duane S. noted that they are considering the possibility of hosting a GIS Symposium at that time and might explore the possibility of working with the Professional Surveyors Association to co-host such an event.

**GIS REVIEW SUBCMTE.** Larry Z. reported that two GIS-related purchase requests had been referred to the Review Subcmte. since the Str. Cmte.'s last meeting. Both purchase requests were for ArcView software, one was from NRC and the other was from the Dept. of Education. Larry Z. reported that all the members of the Review Subcmte. recommended approval of these requests and therefore a meeting of the Subcmte. was not held. Larry also noted that some questions about pricing and upgrades were raised by subcmte. members, but that these would be passed on to CDP. Dennis B. moved, Jim M. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. recommend approval of the ArcView software purchase requests from NRC and the Dept. of Education. The motion passed unanimously (see the attached Voting Record sheet, vote #4).

Larry Z. also brought to the Str. Cmte.'s attention the need to tidy up an earlier motion to recommend approval of a GIS-related purchase request by DEQ for an E-sized color plotter. Larry Z. reported that at the Str. Cmte.'s 5/18/94 meeting, the Str. Cmte. unanimously voted to recommend approval of this purchase request, pending the receipt of the justification document from the Review Subcmte. At that time, Str. Cmte. procedure required such a justification document, but this requirement has since been repealed, largely due to the experience with this particular case. Larry Z. noted that because the author of this justification document was so swamped with their other state duties the document never was completed, but that CDP proceeded with the purchase request based on the Str. Cmte.'s vote and verbal communication with the document author. DEQ now has and is using the printer, but the Str. Cmte.'s records still show its recommendation pending receipt of the justification document. Jim M. moved, Jim B. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. modify its action of 5/18/94 to rescind the requirement of the receipt of the justification document for its recommendation of approval for the DEQ printer. The motion passed with nine voting "for" and one "not voting" (see attached Voting Record sheet, vote #5).

**GPS COORDINATION SUBCMTE.** Jim B. provided the Str. Cmte. with a brief overview of what he included in the State Surveyor's budget proposal for a GPS Base Station network. The budget proposal included \$43,050 for FY '95-96 implementation and operations, and \$7,002 for FY '96-97 operations (on-going). These figures were based on establishing and maintaining a three station network, continuously online, with phone lines, and with limited system maintenance built in to the proposal. Jim B. noted that the prices were based on those for a Trimble system, but did not imply any commitment to that particular vendor. The budget figures also assumed the long-term loan of base station equipment owned by CSD.

**PROPOSED PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF STATE AGENCY'S GIS-RELATED BUDGET REQUESTS.** Larry Z. reviewed the proposals for a review process and criteria which he had developed in discussions with Str. Cmte. members. These proposals had been sent out earlier with the meeting Agenda.

Goal of the Budget Review Process. The goal of the state agency budget review process would be to evaluate and make recommendations to the Legislature on specific state agency GIS initiatives based on:

- their appropriateness as specific GIS application(s),
- their consistency with developing agency and state information technology plans, and
- their merits relative to advancing overall statewide GIS implementation and utilization.

It would not be the role of the GIS Str. Cmte. to make judgements on the relative merits of the various policy objectives, for which the specific GIS applications were designed.

Criteria to be used in Evaluating Agency Budget Proposals. Larry's draft criteria were altered to include the issue of hardware, software, and communications compatibility, but were otherwise accepted by the Str. Cmte. as proposed. The Str. Cmte. also endorsed the idea of putting these general criteria in the form of a questionnaire to provide a means for agencies to provide input, from their perspective, for each criteria area. The agreed upon evaluation criteria were as follows:

#### Appropriate application of the technology

- Is the utilization of GIS a reasonable approach to addressing the agency's particular information/analytical needs
- Is the agency's methodology for GIS utilization a reasonable approach given the agency's needs and available alternatives?
- Are the agency's cost and time estimates within a reasonable range of what might be expected?
- To what extent have the issues been addressed which relate to the compatibility of hardware, software, and communications technologies, both within the agency and between agencies?

#### Coordination and Cooperation

- To what extent is the agency's proposal a component of an integrated information technology needs assessment and development plan for the agency?
- Have reasonable efforts been made by the agency to explore avenues for cooperative GIS utilization and/or development efforts with other agencies and organizations as part of this proposal?
- Is the agency's approach to GIS utilization and implementation consistent with overall long-term statewide GIS development strategy?

#### Data Development

- To what extent do databases and/or coverages to be developed as part of the agency's proposal meet GIS data development priorities identified by the GIS Steering Committee?
- To what extent will data developed as part of the proposal meet existing standards and guidelines for data development?
- To what extent has the agency explored the feasibility of utilizing existing GIS databases in its proposals?
- To what extent has the agency explored the feasibility of meeting other state agencies' data needs (potential second and third party users) by incorporating those needs into the data development design?

Agency Budget Review Process. The Str. Cmte. accepted the review process, as proposed by Larry Z. with a few clarifications. The Str. Cmte. decided to invite agencies to the Str. Cmte.'s Nov. 16th meeting if they wished to address the Str. Cmte. on their GIS-related budget proposals. The modified and adopted budget review process is as follows:

- \* Review of existing survey information on agency's three-year (beginning with FY '94-95) plans for GIS development or expansion

- \* Contact those agencies which had indicated the likelihood of GIS development or expansion during this three-year period to inquire if the survey information accurately reflects current agency intentions and/or to update the survey information. Solicit information regarding how those current GIS intentions are reflected in the agency's proposed budget. Inform the agencies of the Legislature's request for a review of GIS initiatives and outline the process and criteria to be used. Request the agencies to use the evaluation criteria questionnaire to provide background information on their GIS initiatives.
- \* Review agency budget proposals and agency information technology survey responses to identify likely GIS-related initiatives.
- \* Solicit additional information from the respective agencies as seems necessary.
- \* Review and recommendations by the GIS Review Subcmte. to the full GIS Str. Cmte. For the purposes of this review process, the Review Subcmte. shall consist of four members - the regular three members and the alternate member. Review Subcmte. members will recuse themselves on matters directly related to their agency. A minimum of three affirmative votes will be needed to make a recommendation to the Str. Cmte., otherwise the agency budget proposal will be forwarded to the Str. Cmte. without a recommendation. Review will be based on a set of general criteria outlined in advance.
- \* Steering Committee review and action on agency's GIS-related budget proposals based on review criteria and actions by the GIS Review Subcmte. Agency representatives will be provided the opportunity to respond to GIS Review Subcmte. and Str. Cmte. concerns or questions at the Str. Cmte.'s November 16th meeting. The nature of the Str. Cmte.'s action needs further discussion (recommendation/non-recommendation, appropriate/not appropriate, rating relative to approved criteria, etc.)
- \*\* Future years' review process would seek to rely on anticipated agency information technology plans instead of our current GIS survey data for information on planned GIS development. Depending on the Legislature's priority for identifying planned GIS-related expenditures, consideration should also be given to specifically requiring the identification of such GIS-related budget items as part of the budget process.

**FLESHING OUT A PICTURE OF FUTURE NEBRASKA GIS IMPLEMENTATION.** Due to the lateness of the hour, the Str. Cmte. did not go through all of the "education-related" questions related to future GIS implementation. However, Larry Z. did briefly present three major initiatives for the Str. Cmte.'s consideration for next year's work. These draft initiatives had been developed through Larry's conversation with individual Str. Cmte. members. The three major initiatives presented were as follows:

- DOQQ Pilot Project in Saunders County
- Background Research and Development on Major Areas of Potential GIS Application
- State GIS Conference with Ad Hoc Working Groups in Major GIS Application Areas

The Str. Cmte.'s remaining time and energy did not permit extensive discussion of any of these project proposals. They all received favorable reaction from the Str. Cmte. members and further consideration of them was suggested at future meetings. Background information on the first two had been sent out with the meeting agenda. Notable comments included the perception that they were not contradictory in that they all reinforced each other, but that they were potentially competing in terms of available resources. Blaine D. suggested that as an alternative to the DOQQ project, or as a compliment to it, the Str. Cmte. could take existing coverages (for example, OPPD's in 13 SE Nebraska counties) and work with a county to develop a GIS. After a brief discussion it was the conclusion of the Str. Cmte. that the coming spring of 1995 was probably too short of a timeline for

organizing a conference, but that the matter should be considered and a date set at the next meeting if the Str. Cmte. decided to pursue the idea.

NACO Annual Meeting. Dennis W. moved, Blaine D. seconded, that the Str. Cmte. contract for and staff a booth at NACO's Annual meeting on December 6-8, 1994. Larry Z. reported that he had spoken with Marshall Tofte, Annual Meeting Coordinator, and was offered a booth space for \$100 as opposed to the regular \$275 rate. It was noted that if the Str. Cmte. wanted to develop a closer working relationship with NACO, in terms of planning for future GIS implementation, participation in this event was probably a good investment. The motion passed unanimously (see attached Voting Record sheet, vote # 6).

Coordination/Management Questions. Larry Z. asked the Str. Cmte. members to give special attention to giving advance thought to the fifth series of questions regarding coordination and management needs of the Str. Cmte. and providing him with advance written feedback for summary.  
**ARCINFO - INTERGRAPH TRANSLATION PROJECT.** Jon O. reported that due to competing demands on his time, he had not yet gotten this project underway. Jon indicated that he felt that he probably could do some prior to the next meeting.

**UPDATES ON AGENCY GIS ACTIVITIES.** Jon O. reported that it was his understanding that the Sheriff of Jefferson County had recently gotten federal funding for hand-held GPS units. Mahendra B. reported that NRC has contracted with USGS for the development of DOQQs for Lancaster County using GPS technology as opposed to USGS data. Mahendra indicated that NRC planned to have this project completed within the next fiscal year.

**OTHER BUSINESS.** Larry Z. reported that he had just received notice of final approval on his GIS Needs and Benefit Assessment Report from Game and Parks.

**NEXT MEETING.** Wednesday, October 19, 1994, 1:30 pm, East Campus Union - UNL, Lincoln.

**TO DO LISTS:**

Everyone who has not yet listed metadata on their available coverages on the Library Commission's Online Data Catalog please do so.

Everyone - review and provide Larry Z. with advance written feedback on the fifth series of questions regarding coordination and management needs and future GIS implementation. Please have written responses to Larry by October 5th.

Data Inventory Pilot Project Team - review and make recommendations for how metadata on a statewide coverage should be listed on the Online Data Inventory Catalog, i.e. does it need to be listed 93 times for each county. Also develop proposals for the Str. Cmte.'s consideration regarding a System Maintenance Plan and procedures for maintenance of the collected data. Also provide the Str. Cmte. with guidance on how coverages currently held by an agency, but not developed by them should be listed on the Online Catalog.

Larry Z. - review state agency planned GIS initiatives from the December 1993 Interim Planning Report and ask agencies noting likely GIS initiatives to provide an update on their plans and information as to how that is reflected in the state budget. Form the budget review criteria into a questionnaire and ask agency to complete for all GIS initiatives reflected in their budget proposals.

Larry Z. - place the three proposed projects for next year on the 10/29/94 meeting agenda, with particular time dedicated to deciding on a date for any possible GIS Conference.

GIS Steering Committee  
VOTING RECORD

Date 9/21/94

	Attendance	Minutes #1	Date Dev. Policy #2	Date Prior. #3	Review Record #4	DEQ Printer #5	NACO #6					
DAS - Steve Henderson	A											
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling	P		+	+	+	NV	+					
CSD - Perry Wigley Les Howard, <u>Jim Merchant</u>	P		+	+	+	+	+					
NRC - Dayle Williamson Terry Kubicek <u>Mahendra Banwal</u>	P	Unanimous Voice Vote	+	+	+	+	+					
PRO - Rod Armstrong	A/p					+	+	+				
DOR - Jon Ogden	A/p					+	+	+				
Surveyor - Jim Brown	P		+	+	+	+	+					
LRD - Laura Valenziano	A											
John Miyoshi	A											
Blaine Dinwiddie	P		+	+	+	+	+					
Judy Larsen	A											
Larry Worrell	P		NV	+	+	+	A					
Lash Chaffin	A											
Duane Stott	P		+	+	+	+	+					
Dennis Wilson	P		+	+	+	+	+					
TOTALS	8-P /10-P		7(+) 1(NV)	8(+)	10(+)	9(+) 1(NV)	9(+) 1(A)					

P = present  
A = absent

"+" = voting for  
"-" = voting against  
"NV" = not voting