

**GIS Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes - November 13, 1997**

Present were (* authorized to vote):

* Rod Armstrong	State Information Technology Coordinator
Mahendra Bansal	Natural Resources Commission
* Jim Brown	State Surveyor's Office
* Dennis Burling	Department of Environmental Quality
Shane Buscher	Lower Platte NRD
* Lash Chaffin	League of Municipalities
Steve Gaul	Natural Resources Commission
* Dick Genrich	Department of Roads
* Val Goodman	Legislative Research
Roy Hahn	Nebraska Land Title Association
Erik Hubl	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Terry Kubicek	Natural Resources Commission
* Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
Sue Maxwell	Milestone Solutions
* Jim Merchant	Conservation & Survey Division
* John Miyoshi	Lower Platte NRD
Kent Morgan	Lincoln-Lancaster County-Planning
Jerry Odum	NGS
* Jon Ogden	Department of Roads
Boyd Ready	Central NE Public Power Irrigation District
Scott E. Richert	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Shaula Ross	Lower Platte North NRD
Steve Schafer	DAS-Intergovernmental Data Services
Ethel Skinner	Property Tax Division
Chris Stanton	USGS
* Duane Stott	Scotts Bluff County Surveyor
Stu Sutherland	Professional Surveyor's Association of NE
* Cliff Welsh	Keith County Commissioner
Darryl Williams	USGS - Rolla, Missouri
* Dayle Williamson	Natural Resources Commission
* Dennis Wilson	City of Omaha
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 Thursday, November 6, 1997.

ROLL CALL. Vice Chairperson Lash Chaffin called the meeting to order at approximately 1:20 p.m. and requested a call of the roll. Eleven duly authorized representatives were present. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business.

MINUTES. Chairperson Jim Brown asked for the approval of the September minutes. Lash Chaffin moved for the minutes of the September 25, 1997 Steering Committee meeting to be approved as

distributed. Jim Merchant seconded the motion. Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed (*see vote #1 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

PLSS PILOT PROJECT - REPORT FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE. Jim Brown reported that in September, twelve people went to Grand Island for training on the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) software. In September, training was completed on data entry, data management, error checking, and balancing routines. Another training session has been scheduled for next week. The second week of training will cover portioning the townships and doing regional adjustments.

Jim thought that Adams County had entered all of their data, but it had not yet been verified. Some of the other counties, due to time constraints, have fallen a little behind schedule. Hall County had a good portion of their data entered; Dawson County has most of their data entered, except for river data; and Merrick County, due to other difficulties, was not quite as far as long. Jim noted that it was difficult to tell the success of the pilot project at this stage. However, everything appeared to be going well. Jim commented that the success of the pilot project was dependent upon having people at the county level with technical experience and who were dedicated to the project. Jim did not see any reason for the PLSS Pilot Project not to continue on its timeline with all four counties finishing by next Spring.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR LAND RECORD MODERNIZATION. Erik Hubl, who is the committee chair, gave a status report. The Advisory Committee on Standards for Land Record Modernization met today [November 13] for the first time as a full committee. At its previous meeting in September, not all of the members were able to attend. The Advisory Committee decided to use e-mail as their primary way to meet and will not formally meet again until sometime before the next GIS Steering Committee in January.

Based on its initial discussions regarding the focus of its work, the Advisory Committee proposed that their committee name be changed to: The Nebraska Advisory Committee on Standards for Multipurpose Land Information Systems. The Advisory Committee felt that this name more clearly defined their direction. The GIS Steering Committee members indicated general support for the Advisory Committee's wishes in this area.

The Advisory Committee is initially focusing on four core elements for any standards criteria. These four elements are: geodetic control, basemap framework, cadastral data land information, and the attribute information. The Advisory Committee also recognized that there may be potential legislation required for implementation of these standards. Lash Chaffin asked Erik to summarize the four elements so that Lash could incorporate them into a press release for a newsletter. Erik will summarize them and get Jim Brown's approval before giving it to Lash.

Dayle Williamson asked Erik for the Advisory Committee's timeline. Erik noted that the GIS Steering Committee had set July 1998 for a target date. Therefore, the Advisory Committee was also shooting for that date. Erik stressed that the Advisory Committee's work will be a very significant task which will need to undergo an extensive amount of peer review. Val Goodman asked Erik what sort of legislation the Advisory Committee might be asking the GIS Steering Committee to review. Erik indicated that the Advisory Committee was looking for the Steering Committee to take the final recommendations from the Advisory Committee and then move it through the legislative process. Duane Stott added to Erik's comments by stressing that when looking at standards or guidelines, they need to have official backing to be effective. Duane also commented that ideally, standards and all the issues that go with them, such as funding and access, should be addressed in some form all at the same time.

Dayle Williamson agreed with Erik's comment about the need for peer review. Dayle also added that with all of the technology projects going on, when the GIS Steering Committee approaches legislation, it should go through the regular process and it should not just be the Steering Committee acting on it. Dayle noted that there was a process for code-agencies and the members on the GIS Steering Committee representing code-agencies need to follow this process. Jim Brown asked what the process was. Dayle noted that there was a process where proposed legislation goes through a committee with the Governor's Policy Research Office (PRO), then it goes through a core group, and finally receives permission to proceed from the Governor's Office.

Jim Brown did not believe that the GIS Steering Committee was created as a code-agency and asked Dayle to explain why he felt that the GIS Steering Committee would need to follow this process. Dayle said that he had "got that guidance this morning and I think that is all I have to say." Jim Brown commented that he had not received this guidance. Dayle explained that Jim would not have received this guidance, because Jim was not from a code-agency. Jim added, "and neither is this organization." Dayle commented that there are people on this organization [*the GIS Steering Committee*] that represent code-agencies and it was the guidance that they received. Jim noted that such members might have to excuse themselves from the vote, but he asked if that meant the GIS Steering Committee had to follow this process. Jim also noted that the GIS Steering Committee was not created as a function of the Governor's Office. As such, Jim didn't feel that the county and private members of the Steering Committee were bound by the Executive review process. Jim felt the Steering Committee was charged with going forth and developing initiatives of the nature that Erik was discussing.

There was further discussion about whether or not the GIS Steering Committee should follow this process. Part of this discussion included Dayle explaining that initiatives from the Steering Committee were fine, but when it came to getting legislation or voting on legislation, at that point, the representatives from the code-agencies had to run it through the process. Jim asked Dayle what law defined that. Dayle answered that it was administrative functions. Terry Kubicek explained the legal differences between code-agency representatives and other people sitting on the GIS Steering Committee. Jim failed to see how it had any bearing on this group. Dayle offered to set up a meeting, if Jim wanted him to, and noted that he had been asked to have Larry Zink report over there [*Yvonne Norton-Leung, Policy Research Office (PRO)*] on this issue. Duane Stott asked if the legislative mandate that created the GIS Steering Committee didn't charge the group with making recommendations to the Legislature for the implementation of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Larry Zink answered yes. The legislation did include statutory language similar to that.

General discussion on this subject continued. There was a general acknowledgment that code-agencies may need to confer with PRO prior to a vote on proposed legislation, but this process was not directly binding on the GIS Steering Committee as a whole. There was also a general acknowledgment of the importance of coordination with other Information Technology (IT) initiatives being discussed within the administration. Larry Zink indicated that while he felt the discussion might be helpful, he didn't think the Steering Committee had a problem here. Larry noted that in his role as Coordinator, he works closely with Rod Armstrong and Steve Schafer who are involved with a range of administrative IT initiatives. Larry also works to insure that PRO is informed on Steering Committee initiatives. Larry noted that he had, in fact, meet with Yvonne Norton-Leung the day just prior to the meeting [*November 12*]. Larry felt that the communication channels were open and were being used. The discussion ended with Dayle saying he just wanted to make it clear that before code-agencies could say they agreed with legislation, they needed to go through the administrative review process.

GEOSPATIAL DATA ACCESS & FEES SUBCOMMITTEE. The Geospatial Data Access & Fees Subcommittee includes: Rod Armstrong, Lash Chaffin, and Jim Langtry. Jim Langtry reported on the status of the subcommittee. At the last GIS Steering Committee meeting, Lash Chaffin had suggested conducting a survey. Instead, Jim Langtry offered Lash the results of a survey that Lincoln & Lancaster County had sent to a number of governmental agencies around the nation. Jim and Lash had yet to meet.

New York Data Sharing Cooperative. At the last meeting, Larry Zink provided the GIS Steering Committee with information on the New York Data Sharing Cooperative. Since then, Larry has had a fair number of people express some interest in it. Information regarding the Cooperative was mailed to the Steering Committee as a part of the Proposed Agenda packet. Larry wanted to know if anyone else had the opportunity to look at it and asked if this was something the committee was interested in pursuing. Larry also noted that he had recently visited with Senator Raikes [*new Senator from Lancaster County*]. Val Goodman was also at the meeting. Senator Raikes had expressed an interest in what the GIS Steering Committee was doing. One of his particular areas of interest was data access and fees. Larry shared with him the general concept of the New York Data Sharing Cooperative. Duane Stott thought it was a good concept and felt that it should be carefully examined. Jim Brown suggested referring the New York Cooperative back to the Geospatial Data Access & Fees Subcommittee. Lash Chaffin also suggested adding Val Goodman to the subcommittee. Val did not object.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING FOR GIS STEERING COMMITTEE. Erik Hubl, John Miyoshi, and Dennis Wilson are members of the Long-Range Planning Subcommittee, along with Larry Zink who serves as a resource person for the subcommittee. The Interim Long-Range Planning Subcommittee Report - 11/13/97 was previously mailed to the Steering Committee members as part of the Proposed Agenda packet. Dennis Wilson highlighted some of the major points of the report. The first part of the report is an executive summary of the subcommittee's recommendation to be discussed at the Steering Committee's January meeting. The second part of the report is what the subcommittee felt had been addressed since the 1995 goals were set. The subcommittee report made recommendations based on the progress achieved in each area since then:

1. Recommend that the GIS Steering Committee assign ad hoc task forces for each of the previously designated statewide databases that have been prioritized for development.
2. Recommend that the GIS Steering Committee give increased attention to the exploration of two key components to facilitate local government land record modernization: 1) assistance with funding and 2) assistance with technical planning.
3. Recommend that the GIS Steering Committee organize itself to directly address its high priority of GIS education and outreach focused on government officials and representatives.

Other recommendations for the GIS Steering Committee, not directly related to these earlier goals, included:

- > Garnering increased financial support from the Legislature for its operations and increasing activities.
- > Push for the adoption of a funding mechanism to help fund GIS development statewide.
- > Return to a monthly meeting schedule and find funding for it.
- > Investigate the acquisition of statewide Digital Raster Graphics (DRGs).
- > Consider the establishment of an ongoing Planning Subcommittee.

Dennis asked the Steering Committee to also review the last section of the report which addressed the specific long-range goals that the Steering Committee has addressed over the last few years.

Discussion of the Steering Committee's expectations for the January Long-Range Planning Session. Lash Chaffin asked what action was being requested from the Steering Committee. Dennis explained that the purpose of the interim report was to generate discussion for the January meeting. Dayle Williamson added that at the January session, the Steering Committee should have a shared vision on what GIS should look like in Nebraska and how its needs tie in with other initiatives that are going on.

Jim Brown asked if there were any more issues that needed to be added and suggested that the Steering Committee accept the Interim Long-Range Planning Report as a road map for the January meeting. Jim also asked if everyone was still comfortable with the January planning session. Larry Zink explained that the January meeting would include a Thursday afternoon planning session with a regular business meeting on the following Friday morning. There were no objections to either of these.

NEBRASKA TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION INITIATIVE & GIS. Background Briefing. Rod Armstrong gave a presentation on the Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative. This initiative began last March when Governor Nelson asked the Lt. Governor to look at efforts to coordinate telecommunications and infotech in the State, how the State is organized to do that, and to make recommendations for improvement. Rod Armstrong and the Lt. Governor have given this presentation several times over the last few weeks to describe the Lt. Governor's findings and what is being called the Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative. This information will be publicly announced at a press conference on Wednesday, November 19, 1997.

Rod used a PowerPoint presentation to show various maps of Nebraska's current Telecommunications Infrastructure. These Nebraska maps included: Television & Radio Network; Digital Satellite Receiver; Nebraska Video Conferencing Network (NVCN); Distance Learning Pod Locations; Fiber Optic Cable; and Cellular Coverage. As shown by these maps, Rod noted that Nebraska is blessed with a significant amount of physical infrastructure. Nebraska is ahead of many states in terms of what has already been installed and is available for use. The problem lies with the organizational structure such as: a distributed decision-making authority, inadequate communication among groups, and lack of a high-level strategic direction. Other problems include: limited resources and inadequate leveraging; lack of good cost accounting; shortage of maintenance and support; and the tendency to focus on the wrong things.

The goals of the Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative are to: establish strategic direction; integrate decision-making processes; leverage purchasing power; invest in infrastructure based on user needs; and to achieve statewide interoperability. The vision for the initiative is: "Customer Satisfaction: Citizens receiving the best possible service from their government." Currently, there is not a process to integrate decision-making and to coordinate the user needs; thereby, leveraging investments causing the State to end up with duplicate and incompatible systems. Therefore, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) was created.

The responsibilities of the NITC will be more high-level and statewide and will establish the vision and goals to guide the development and use of information technology infrastructure in Nebraska. The Commission will also set policy to create an environment and infrastructure that will meet the needs of the users in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The Commission will be a nine member board with the Governor or Lt. Governor serving as the Commission's Chair. Commission members will be appointed by the Governor and approved by the Legislature and includes: one representative of state

government; one representative of higher education; one representative of elementary and secondary education; one representative of Nebraska communities; and five representatives of private businesses or organizations who are major users of information technology.

Executive Committee Proposals. Jim Brown gave a brief overview on the draft recommendations that the Executive Committee had formulated and unanimously endorsed. It was the Executive Committee's intent that these draft recommendations be discussed by the GIS Steering Committee and considered for recommendation to the Lt. Governor for possible inclusion in the Governor's Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative. Jim Brown reported that the Technology Coordination Initiative may be an opportunity to present some of the needs of the GIS Steering Committee to the Executive and Legislative branches. The Executive Committee had met on Wednesday of the previous week and endorsed the following proposals (*see copy attached to the agenda*):

- ♦ GIS Steering Committee Operating Budget of \$10,000 for travel expenses, postage, and printing.
- ♦ An additional staff person for education, coordination, and technical assistance for \$60,000.
- ♦ Funding of \$50,000 for education, outreach, and technical assistance programming, including the newsletter.
- ♦ Expand the State Surveyors Office's statutory area of responsibility to include assisting local government with cadastral and geo-referenced mapping.

Jim Brown provided a brief background rationale for each of the four recommendations. If approved by the GIS Steering Committee, these recommendations would be given to Rod Armstrong, who would give them to the Lt. Governor, who may wish to include them in the Nebraska Technology Commission Initiative. Jim Brown noted that he was first presented with the Technology Coordination Initiative approximately two weeks ago. Considering the short timeline, there was not enough time to develop a comprehensive GIS technology plan for the State of Nebraska. The Executive Committee felt that these proposals were modest and based on previously identified needs, but it didn't preclude making more recommendations to the NITC at some point in the future.

Lash Chaffin felt these proposals were a good way to bring forth a vision that Duane Stott and some others have had for several years, but which the GIS Steering Committee had fallen short of. Without these kind of resources and initiatives, Jim Merchant didn't think the Steering Committee would be able to implement the types of recommendations that the Long-Rang Planning Subcommittee had reported earlier in the meeting. Jim Merchant also shared his belief that if the Steering Committee wanted to accelerate its achievements, this type of approach was necessary. Jim Brown expressed his regrets that there hadn't been enough time and opportunity to go through a longer planning process to develop these proposals, but commented that some times it is necessary to respond to the opportunities that present themselves. Larry Zink noted that one proposal that was discussed by the Executive Committee, but not recommended by the Executive Committee, was the Wisconsin model of providing a funding and coordination mechanism for work with local governments. Larry felt there was considerable support for this concept in both the Executive and the Steering Committees, but there was concern that more ground work needed to be done before proceeding with the idea.

Dayle Williamson reported that after the Executive Committee meeting, he had shared the Executive Committee's proposals with some NRC staff members, and after further review, Dayle sent a note to Larry Zink recommending the removal of the last paragraph (*Technical Assistance with Cadastral & Geo-Referenced Mapping*). Dayle felt that the PLSS Pilot Project was just beginning and it was too early to base any conclusions. Dayle restated his earlier concern that the Steering Committee should be sensitive about proposing any

legislative language without a thorough analysis.

Jim Brown indicated that he was a bit taken aback by Dayle's change of position, particularly because the Executive Committee had waited for Dayle's input. Jim Brown had shared this proposal with Rod Armstrong, because he felt that the counties needed some assistance. Jim said that part of the charge of his office was to assist county surveyors. He noted that is what he does in his business and it didn't have anything to do with what Natural Resources does. Jim Brown also indicated that if his agency was specifically charged with going out to help counties technically geo-reference (and Jim noted that geo-referencing is what he does), then he would have the ability to go to the Legislature each year and ask for funding for it. Jim noted that the Legislature could then make its own decision on how to fund it. Jim commented that whether the PLSS Pilot Project ultimately proves to be the way or not, there was still a need for assistance to help the counties put a cadastral land base in place.

Dayle raised the question as to whether Jim Brown couldn't use his existing authority through the Board of Educational Lands & Funds to move this type of work ahead. Jim didn't feel this proposal had a great deal to do with the Board of Educational Lands & Funds. Jim noted that, in addition to his work for Educational Lands & Funds, he is also charged by the Legislature to do certain other things. Among the things Jim mentioned were: disputed surveys, giving advice and instructions to the county surveyors, and maintaining plats and maps of original government surveys. Jim didn't think the Board of Educational Lands & Funds would complain if he did work for the counties. However, Jim made the point that if everyone wanted this work done and they want it funded, then he suggested that it be made a Legislative mandate. He could then go to the Legislature and ask for funding to do the work. Jim noted that when he does things like the current PLSS Pilot Project in four counties, he does the work himself and doesn't ask for extra funding. Jim said he can't do that for all 93 counties. Jim indicated that the Steering Committee had identified one of the things that needs to be done (creating a cadastral layer and a PLSS layer) and he didn't understand why authorization and funding to assist counties with this was problematic to the Natural Resources Commission.

Jon Ogden moved to accept the Executive Committee's draft report so the Steering Committee could formally discuss it. Lash Chaffin seconded the motion. Lash felt that the language related to the State Surveyor's Office was consistent with the rest of the proposal and noted that the budget part of the proposal was also written as a legislative proposal. Lash suggested that in order to get funding for this type of work in Jim's budget, this was the way Jim felt he needed to ask for it. Lash didn't see anything controversial about asking for something that was already being done and added that this proposal was based on helping agencies work together, which was currently very popular in government. Dayle noted that there were things his own agency needed as well, but was not given the same offer, nor was DEQ or the Department of Roads. Dayle was wondering why one agency was singled out with this proposal.

Dennis Burling made an amendment to the motion *[to accept the Executive Committee's Report]* to divide the motion into two parts. The first part to be voted on would be the budget proposal and the second part would be the technical assistance *[last paragraph]*. Dennis was asking for this so the code-agencies could vote on the first part. John Miyoshi seconded the motion. Jim Brown didn't have any problems with splitting the motion. However, he explained that this was not going to be proposed to the Legislature by the GIS Steering Committee. These proposals were going to be given to the Lt. Governor to be considered as part of the Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative. The Governor or Lt. Governor may or may not wish to submit them to the Legislature. Jim felt that surely the Steering Committee could give recommendations to the Lt. Governor. Hearing no further discussion, Larry Zink called the roll to split the amendment. The motion passed *(see vote #2 on the attached Voting Record sheet)*.

Jim Brown asked for discussion on the Budget Proposal. Jim noted that based on the short timeline that the Executive Committee had been given, the dollar figures were somewhat arbitrarily decided upon and probably warranted further discussion. Larry Zink expressed some concern about the ability of the Steering Committee to gear up from \$3,000 to \$50,000 for outreach and technical assistance within a year's time frame. Larry noted, that while he had no reservations about the need for outreach, education, and technical assistance on this level, this would be a significant change from the current budget and work of the Steering Committee. The point was made in discussion that the Steering Committee would have six months to prepare for such a shift. Jim Merchant added that the Steering Committee has always expressed a need for technical assistance, but has not yet been able to fulfill it. As an example, Jim Merchant noted that the community colleges have often asked how they might help fulfill this need, but there hasn't been any resources to work with them.

John Miyoshi asked Rod Armstrong if the budget numbers were realistic. Rod did not know, but suggested that any request should be well documented. Cliff Welsh noted that the NACO Technology Group is working to coordinate some of these same efforts. Cliff was concerned that it may not be beneficial to offer help to counties before the counties themselves had determined what help they needed. Cliff's first thought was that assistance to the counties needed to be in a workshop format on a statewide level. Jim Brown stated his agreement with Cliff relative to a statewide effort and the merits of workshops. He also questioned whether the Steering Committee was asking for sufficient resources to make that possible and this was just a start. Lash Chaffin supported the idea of having a person available to help coordinate and organize this training.

Ethel Skinner, Property Tax Division, was recognized from the floor to address the Executive Committee recommendations. Ethel apologized for her need to jump ahead and speak to the second part of the motion related to technical assistance. However, she had a prior commitment and needed to leave. Ethel raised the question as to whether Cathy Lang, Property Tax Administrator, had been consulted relative to providing technical assistance with cadastral mapping. Ethel noted that the Property Tax Administrator is statutorily responsible for cadastral mapping. Jim Brown indicated that unfortunately this consultation had not yet been possible, because Cathy had been unavailable during most of the two week period that this initiative took shape. Ethel jokingly mentioned that Cathy might be very happy for Jim to take over the responsibility for cadastral mapping. Jim responded by saying, "no I'm sorry, that is not open for discussion," and stated his desire to be very clear that he was in no way proposing that his office take on the responsibility for tax mapping. He restated his intentions to help counties with geo-referencing tax maps, much like the current efforts underway with the PLSS Pilot Project. Ethel noted her belief that it was important to talk with Cathy about this technical assistance effort and Jim stated his commitment to continue to try to make that happen.

Cliff Welsh noted that NACO was also trying to clarify what the relationship is between the counties and the Department of Revenue relative to cadastral mapping. Stu Sutherland, representative of the Professional Surveyor's Association of Nebraska, was recognized from the floor to address this topic. Stu noted the importance of technical assistance to work with counties so that a solid base is laid for county GIS.

After some further discussion, Lash Chaffin called the question on the budget part of the amendment. Once again, Jim Brown clarified that the vote was to recommend this as part of the Governor's Nebraska Technology Coordination Initiative. Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed (*see vote #3 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

Jim Brown asked for discussion on the second part of the amendment. John Miyoshi noted Dayle's comment about the lack of opportunity for other state agencies to have similar proposals. Jim Brown was not aware of another state agency who was charged with being a service agency to do surveying. John wasn't thinking just about PLSS, but any other technology issues. Jim asked Dayle if he provided a function or support to counties or expertise in geo-referencing or surveying. Dayle noted that DWR, Game & Parks, and NRC are all involved in geo-referenced maps. Dayle stated his belief that the Steering Committee should carefully think this through and recommended voting against this part of the proposal.

In response to John's comment, Larry Zink noted that Dayle had briefly raised the issue of support for DOQQs during the Executive Committee. Larry agreed that, given a longer timeline, it would be appropriate to look at some of the other agencies' technology issues. Larry noted that he has advocated for some time, and continues to do so, that the GIS Steering Committee should go through a process of looking at the core framework databases, and then as part of its coordination and management functions, ask a specific agency to be responsible for developing and maintaining specific databases. For example, ask NRC if they would be responsible for developing and maintaining DOQQs and ask the Department of Roads to be responsible for maintaining and developing transportation databases. Each agency would be asked to take on the responsibility of the database, and where appropriate, seek to incorporate that responsibility into their statutes.

General discussion about the proposal followed. Both Duane Stott and Jim Merchant spoke in support of the importance of this technical assistance, while acknowledging possible room for wordsmithing. Jim Merchant also noted that there were probably other initiatives deserving support, but he suspected that a consensus on most of them could not be quickly achieved. Larry noted that the ideas that were put forward for the Executive Committee's consideration were quickly formulated and based on judgment calls as to what types of proposals were likely to quickly generate broad support from the Steering Committee based on previous Steering Committee discussions. Other general discussion on the technical proposal included Jon Ogden's comment that Jim Brown had proposed this to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee accepted it. Therefore, Jon noted that if the Steering Committee endorsed this proposal, then Jim would be submitting any legislative funding or budget requests. Larry Zink felt that if anyone else had any issues to be addressed, then they should be brought to the table for discussion. John Miyoshi asked Dayle if he had any NRC issues ready such as the DOQQs and the SSURGO soil efforts which were important to John. Dayle said he could put these on the table, but did not feel that going through the GIS Steering Committee was the proper avenue. It was agency work and NRC would have to follow proper procedures. Dayle objected to Jim Brown using this forum to do agency work. John Miyoshi and other Steering Committee members saw this as an opportunity for some new funds.

At Dayle's request, Terry Kubicek was recognized from the floor. Terry quoted the State Surveyor statutes #84-407 and #84-408 noting that the State Surveyor works for the Board of Educational Lands & Funds. Based on this, Terry submitted to the Steering Committee, that as a matter of law, this proposal should not be directed to the State Surveyor, but to the Board of Educational Lands & Funds to expand its jurisdiction. Terry also suggested that the proposed language was so broad that it would preempt other agencies such as the NRC from providing assistance to NRDs with geo-referencing. Jim Brown noted that there were other areas of the statutes related to his office, which Terry didn't read, that charge it with specific responsibilities separate from the Board of Educational Land & Funds. Jim also noted that he did not see how one agency being charged with a responsibility of providing a certain type of assistance precluded others from also offering that type of assistance. Jim also noted that if the Steering Committee supported the proposal, it was likely that the Lt. Governor might change the language. It was also likely that the reviser of statutes would change the language. Jim said that the issue was whether the Steering

Committee wanted his office to provide this type of support to local governments. After further discussion, Jim Brown called the question. Larry Zink called roll and the motion failed. There were six votes for, two against, and three non-voting (*see vote #4 on the attached Voting Record sheet*). Under GIS Steering Committee operating procedures, a motion requires eight votes to pass.

While voting, Dennis Burling noted that he was abstaining, based on the issues that Dayle raised earlier in the meeting and expressed his disappointment that Dayle voted as a code-agency based on Dayle's previous comments during the meeting. Dennis asked Dayle to explain the discussion he had on why code-agencies should not be voting and why he voted on the issue. Dayle explained that the discussion he had this morning at the core group meeting made it clear that when issues came from the GIS Steering Committee in support of Legislation, they had to go through the established process. Based on the instructions that Dayle was given, Dennis did not understand why Dayle voted when he should have abstained. Dayle did not understand it that way, but was willing to change his vote to abstention if Dennis felt that was better. Dennis added that based on the information that Dayle had been given that morning, Dennis called his boss [*during the meeting*] and was told to abstain from voting; and therefore, could not change his vote. However, DEQ would meet with PRO regarding the issue. When asked, Jon Ogden also chose not to change his abstaining vote.

FRAMEWORK DATA SURVEY. Larry Zink reminded the Steering Committee about the Framework Data Survey as sponsored by NSGIC and FGDC. Local government and state agencies will be surveyed to see who is doing what with framework data. Attached to the agenda was a copy of a cooperative agreement between the Nebraska Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC). Larry noted that DAS would be replaced with Intergovernmental Data Services Division. Most of the work will be done through Larry Zink's office with assistance from Lash Chaffin for mailings to the cities. John Miyoshi moved to approve the cooperative agreement and authorized Larry to sign it. Jon Ogden seconded. There was no further discussion. Larry Zink called roll and the motion passed (*see vote #5 on the attached Voting Record sheet*).

EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS. Mid-America GIS Symposium. Larry confirmed the Steering Committee's decision to approve a \$200 benefactor for the Mid-America GIS Symposium. There were no objections.

USGS UPDATE. Darryl Williams reported that the USGS has completed the DRGs for the State of Nebraska, except for one one-degree block. DRGs can be ordered from Chuck Peterson at (573) 308-3696. There is also a Web site that will provide the status of the DRGs – mcmcw.b.er.usgs.gov/drg.

The National Hydro Data Sets is currently being developed by USGS and Darryl noted that USGS wants to ensure coordination with Nebraska's efforts. National Transportation Data Sets will be looked at over the next two years.

OTHER BUSINESS. Larry Zink announced that Jim Merchant had received the John Wesley Power award from the USGS.

Jim Merchant and Larry Zink had discussed the possibility of broadening the list serve. Jim Merchant suggested creating two lists. There were no objections from the Steering Committee.

John Miyoshi raised a question about notification and minutes of the Executive Committee. Larry acknowledged that he failed to notify the other members of the Steering Committee about the Executive

Committee, in part, due to the last minute grappling of an available time and date. The minutes were essentially the proposals that were mailed out with the agenda.

Jim Langtry announced that Lancaster County had put up on their web site the Lancaster County HARN points and their associated data.

The next meeting is the long-range planning meeting scheduled for the afternoon of Thursday, January 15, 1998 and a regular business meeting on following morning of Friday, January 16, 1998.

GIS Steering Committee
VOTING RECORD

Date 11/13/97

	Roll Call	Minutes # 1	Split Motion # 2	1st 3 Items # 3	Face Cmt # 4	4th Item Cmt # 5	Frankfort Data Survey						
DAS - Rod Armstrong	A/p	A	+	A	A	A							
DEQ - <u>Dennis Burling</u> Tom Lamberson	P	+	+	+	NV	A							
CSD - Perry Wigley Les Howard, <u>Jim Merchant</u>	P	+	+	+	+	+							
NRC - <u>Dayle Williamson</u> Terry Kubicek	P	+	+	+	-	+							
PRO - Tom Ryan Yvonne Norton - Leung	A												
DOR - Jon Ogden	P	+	+	+	NV	+							
Surveyor - Jim Brown	A/p	+	+	+	NV	+							
LRD - Laura Valenziano Val Goodman	P	+	+	NV	A	A							
John Miyoshi	P	+	+	+	+	+							
Blaine Dinwiddie	A												
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	-	-	+							
Larry Worrell <u>Jim Langtry</u>	P	+	+	+	+	+							
Lash Chaffin	P	+	+	+	+	A							
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+							
Dennis Wilson	P	+	+	+	+	+							
TOTALS	11-P/ 13-P	12(+)	13(+)	10(+) 1(NV)	6(+) 2(-) 3(NV)	9(+)							

P = present
A = absent

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