



North Carolina
Geographic Information Coordinating Council
• Local Government Committee

MINUTES
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
August 27, 2009

PROCEEDINGS

The quarterly meeting of the Local Government Committee (LGC), a committee of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC), was held on August 27, 2009

PRESENT

LGC members:

Kat Clifton, City of Salisbury, representing NCLM
Gene Hume, Buncombe County, representing Carolina URISA
Alex Rickard, Eastern Carolina Council, representing ARCED
Jerry Simmons, Pender County, representing NC PMA
Julie Stamper, Pasquotank County, representing NC ACC

Others:

Chris Butts, Moore County, for LGC member Chris Koltyk, representing NCLGISA
Ryan Draughn, NCLM
Chad Ives, Town of Havelock, LGC rep to the SMAC
Tom Tribble, CGIA, Staff to the LGC

ABSENT

None

ELECTION OF CHAIR

Prior to the meeting, Tom Tribble sent out a note describing the obligations and commitments of the LGC Chair. Tom asked if there were any questions. There were

none. The floor was opened for nominations. Alex Rickard nominated Julie Stamper. There were no other nominations. Julie was elected chair for the 2009-10 term.

LGC APPOINTMENTS TO OTHER COMMITTEES

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee

Jason Mann's term as SMAC rep is for 2008-1010. Chad Ives's term has expired. Chad only served for one year, filling Julie Stamper's term when Julie was elected chair last year. Chad was asked if he would like to serve another full term and he agreed. Chad's term will be 2009-1011.

Technical Advisory Committee

At its Aug 12 meeting, the GICC approved the TAC bylaws. The bylaws call for the LGC to appoint a member to the TAC. Julie suggested that the person be very technical. Jerry Simmons asked what issues the TAC would address. Julie said that the TAC will study and report on technical issues that are assigned to the TAC by the GICC. She thought that initially the TAC would be asked to assess the technical architecture for the NC OneMap. Alex agreed and suggested that while this might be primarily a concern of state government it was nevertheless important for the LGC to be represented by a strong technical person. Julie suggested Jason Mann, City of Asheville. Gene Hume suggested Dave Michelson, who works for Jason at the City of Asheville and who has a strong technical background especially in web allocations and open source solutions. Chad suggested Anthony Thomas from New Hanover County. Alex also asked if there were local government reps who participated on the original committee that designed NC OneMap. Tom recalled that Andy Goretti, Mecklenburg County, was an active participant on the original design group.

Questions arose about the frequency of meetings and whether the LGC rep would have to attend in person. Tom will contact TAC Chair Kelly Laughton with these questions.

LGC members will contact the candidates and explore their interest and willingness to do this job. Tom noted that it is important the candidates have some understanding of the statewide coordination program and the role of the Local Government Committee. Tom also noted that if Jason is interested but feels that he does not have time to serve on both the SMAC and the TAC, the LGC can find a replacement for Jason on the SMAC.

Action Item – Julie will contact Jason Mann about his interest and Dave Michelson's interest, since Dave works for Jason. Julie will also contact Andy Goretti. Chad will contact Anthony Thomas.

GIS Advisory Team (A Team)

Julie noted that the membership of the A Team needs to be reviewed given that we have 3 new LGC members and that it has been a couple of years since the last A Team

appointments. The current list of A Team members can be found at the GICC web site - http://ncgicc.net/Portals/3/documents/LGC_ATeam_Members_Jun2009.pdf.

Tom described the role of the A Team. It was established by the LGC several years ago to serve as a pool of knowledge and expertise to help the LGC review proposed standards, policy proposal documents, and other issues before the GICC. The burden is not onerous as requests to A Team members average 2 per year.

After some discussion it was agreed that each LGC member will review the list of A Team members that were appointed by her/his organization; determine whether that person wants to continue on the A Team; and submit to Tom new appointments. No deadline was established.

Action Item – Each LGC member will reassess her/his A Team appointments and make new appointments or reappointments.

Stream Mapping Advisory Committee

Joe Sewash from CGIA, chair of the Stream Mapping Advisory Committee, has requested that the LGC appoint representatives to this committee. Tom suggested to candidates – Nick Harvey from the City of Asheville and Wright Lowery from Wake County. Both have a strong interest in the use of surface water data in water quality applications. Nick has worked with the local resolution National Hydrography Dataset that was developed as part of Phase 1 of North Carolina's stream mapping effort. Wright works regularly with the NC Division of Water Quality on water quality issues and is located in Raleigh. Tom was asked to contact Nick and Wright to gauge their interest.

Action Item – Tom will contact Nick Harvey and Wright Lowery to inquire about their willingness to serve on this committee

Alex suggested that we use the LGC Alert tool to reach out to the local government community to solicit volunteers for appointments to the TAC, the GIS Advisory Team and Stream Mapping Advisory Committee. He suggested that we need to promote these opportunities and not fully rely on our personal contacts in an effort to get more members of the local government community engaged in issues that affect them. The other LGC members enthusiastically agreed.

For the benefit of the new members, Tom described the process of issuing a LGC Alert. Tom prepares a draft email message and shares it with the LGC members to get their input. When the final message is ready to go, Tom will send it to the LGC members who are responsible for distributing it to the various list serves. They are:

CURISA – Gene Hume
NCGIS – Julie Stamper
NCLGISA – Chris Koltyk
PMA – Jerry Simmons

Action Item - Tom will prepare a written description of the various committees for which the LGC is seeking volunteers and distribute the draft LGC Alert as soon as possible. LGC members will send out the LGC Alert as designated.

NC 911 Board

Over the past year, the LGC has pressed for having some involvement in and participation on the NC 911 Board. It had been noted previously that the Public Safety Answering Points and 911 agencies in counties frequently acquire GIS data and may request basic GIS support from local government GIS shops. However, the NC 911 Board does not include someone who can represent the local government GIS community. At the request of the LGC, the GICC asked whether a local government GIS community representative could participate on or attend NC 911 Board meetings. Billie Willis, then chair of the NC 911 Board, reported that the membership of the NC 911 Board was determined by legislation. He also noted that while the public is invited to attend and listen, the NC 911 Board does not take public comments during the meeting.

The LGC discussed the idea of appointing someone to attend the meeting despite the inability to comment on issues. Tom suggested that the LGC representative could report to the LGC, which could prepare and submit a formal letter to the NC 911 Board after their meetings with comments and recommendations. Gene noted that if the LGC can provide useful feedback, it may lead to opportunities for better participation in the future.

The LGC suggested Chris Koltyk as the LGC rep to attend NC 911 Board meetings since he was the person who originally raised concerns about the demands made on GIS staff by local E911 staff and who has asked questions to clarify how E911 money can be spent.

Action Item - Chris Butts will ask Chris Koltyk if he will attend meetings.

Ryan Draughn noted his intention to add the NC 911 Board meetings to his calendar. Tom suggested that Ryan's attendance would be very valuable to the LGC and asked if he had a counterpart in the Association of County Commissioners who could also attend. Ryan suggested that Judy Rhyne, the ACC's Information Systems Director, might be able to attend. Ryan will talk with her.

Enterprise License Agreement Work Group

(Note – this discussion actually took place at the beginning of the meeting, prior to the election of the chair, while the LGC was waiting for one member to join the phone call.)

At the Aug 12 GICC meeting, there was a discussion of the State Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with ESRI. The agreement that was negotiated several years ago is about to expire. The State Government Users committee will work with the Office of the State Chief Information Officer, which will negotiate the new agreement. Questions

arose at the GICC meeting about whether local governments could be included in the ELA. Mr. George Bakolia, State Chief Information Officer, said as we negotiate a new ESRI agreement, local governments should not be excluded from the discussion, but the state cannot subsidize local government.

Ryan reported that Sharon Hayes, Deputy State Chief Information Officer, planned to convene a work group to consider the ELA. She indicated to Ryan that she would like to have a representative of local government participate on that group. Ms. Hayes met Chris Koltyk at a NCLGISA meeting and suggested that he could be a candidate. Julie said that Chris would be good but wanted to be sure that had the time to do it.

Action Item - Chris Butts will ask Chris Koltyk.

Tom asked if the LGC should identify another person who could join Chris Koltyk. Ryan indicated that he expected to participate on the working group and could help Chris represent local government. Ryan also noted that Shannon Tufts, Director of the Center for Public Technology at the UNC School of Government hoped to participate on work group.

GICC REPORT

The complete minutes for the August 12, 2009 meeting of the GICC are available at the GICC web site.

Julie Stamper gave a review of the highlights of the GICC meeting.

As a result of the State GIS Study, the General Assembly included funding in the 2010-11 budget to fund some of the recommendations. The money was less than hoped for but 7 positions at CGIA will be funded and CGIA will be transferred from the Department of Environment & Natural Resources to the Office of the State Chief Information Officer. As part of these changes, the Management & Operations Committee will be working to develop a Business Plan for GIS Implementation. The plan will include an orthophotography acquisition plan. The NC 911 Board has expressed some interest in using E911 funds to support imagery acquisition and approached the M&O to ask for an ortho plan.

Julie noted that the GICC approved the revised Digital Orthophotography Standard, which had been approved by the SMAC and vetted by the Secretary of State, the GICC committees, including the LGC, and other groups, including the NC Property Mappers Association, was before the GICC for adoption. The standard will be officially adopted for the Land Records Management Program by the Secretary of State and incorporated into the Land Records Management Program's digital specifications. Gene asked if the standard is available on the GICC web site. Tom reported yes, that the link was in the "Announcements" box at the GICC website.

Julie reported that GICC Chair Lee Mandell is seeking anecdotal stories of GIS successes and innovative uses that can be included in the GICC's Annual Report to the Governor and General Assembly. Kat Clifton noted that ESRI is working on a new book, *Measuring Up, Volume II – The Business Case for GIS* (<http://gis.esri.com/industries/business/measuringup2009/index.cfm>) that highlights similar success stories, particularly those that document a return on investment. The deadline for submissions is December 2009.

Action Item – LGC members will forward to Julie information on local government GIS success stories in NC.

The Master Address project is complete. At the GICC meeting, Project Manager Joe Sewash reported that the data will be stored by 10-county regions and made available for download from the web in the near future. Tom reported that the data is not on-line yet but should be available soon. When it is, announcements will be made over the various list serves.

Action Item - Tom will notify LGC members directly when the master address is posted.

Julie noted that Research Triangle Institute gave a presentation on the use of GIS at the national level to track and understand the spread of swine or NIH1 flu. Julie reported that it was one of the most interesting presentations that she had seen at the GICC.

Alex noted that John Correllus is leading a technical architecture subcommittee of the State Government Users committee (SGUC) and noted that there seemed to be some conflict between the efforts of the SGUC and the TAC. Alex noted that the cause of the conflict was unclear and asked Tom if he could explain and would this conflict affect local governments. Tom replied that he thought that the SGUC simply wanted to insure that it has the opportunity to be fully engaged in a discussion about items that may affect state agencies. One of John Correllus's concerns was that the TAC would only include one SGUC member. GICC Chair Lee Mandell indicated that she planned to appoint John Farley from the NC Department of Transportation as one of her GICC appointments so that will mean another state agency representative on the TAC. Tom was unsure how much this issue will affect local governments.

SMAC REPORT

Jason Mann, one of the LGC representatives to the SMAC, previously submitted a written summary of the July 8 SMAC meeting to the LGC members. Chad Ives, who missed the July 8 SMAC, meeting summarized the report from Jason's written summary. The complete minutes for the July 8, 2009 meeting of the SMAC are available at the GICC web site.

- The 2009 NAIP imagery is currently being flown. The State of NC was able to find funds to pay the cost of acquiring a CIR band. The Ortho work Group is developing an issue paper regarding CIR for presentation at the next SMAC meeting.
- Alex Rickard presented the latest information on the statewide street centerline standard. Alex will also make this presentation at the LGC meeting (*see below*).
- There has been a lull in activity by the Working Group for Seamless Parcels as it waits for the formal award of the EPA grant. Members of the WGSP are currently contacting local governments who did not respond to the survey in Ramona and encouraging them to complete
- The SMAC adopted the new charter for the NC Board of Geographic Names. Amy Durden was announced as the LGC appointment to the NC BGN.
- There was a lengthy discussion of the possibility of including NAIP leaf-on orthophotography on the official list of NC OneMap priority data layers. Tom was asked to explain. Tom reported that when NC OneMap was developed, the GICC adopted a list of 37 priority data layers, representing those layers that the GIS community thought were most critical to support, including seeking cost share funds for acquisition. The NAIP photography was not on the original list. Several members of the SMAC, primarily state agency representatives, have been making the case for adding NAIP photography to the list of priority layers. It is likely that the new GIS implementation plan effort will revisit the make-up of that list.
- The Floodplain Mapping Program provided an update to the SMAC and reported that building footprints are expected to be complete by May 201. FMP may solicit a QC review by counties prior to the release of the data in May.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Working Group for Roads and Transportation

Alex made a PowerPoint presentation on the status of the proposed statewide street centerline standard and the centerline data translation initiative.

Alex reported that the goals for rewriting the state centerline standard include: expanding the functionality of the standard by supporting routing applications, placing a greater emphasis on geospatial data integrity (topology), and providing more guidance to local government data providers. The specific recommendations from the WGRT include adding unique ID numbers for every street and every street segment, adding specific topology rules to ensure centerlines form routing networks, and adding additional fields to the centerline attribute table for routing applications. These additional fields include speed limits for routing, one-way street values, and elevation fields that identify at-grade intersections and overpasses.

Alex reported that the revised standard will also include additional attribute tables or event tables to support other functions such as pavement management, dispatching, and crash data. These event tables will be included as appendices in the standard with documented methods for attaching them to the centerline data.

Alex reported that the WGRT hopes to provide more guidance to the local data provider by creating supplemental documents such as sample datasets, a data model poster, and a centerline best practices document to provide examples of divided highways, streets with multiple street names, address ranges for interstates, and other common centerline issues.

Alex reported that the WGRT is also working on a centerline data translation project. The goal of this project is similar to the Working Group for Seamless Parcels. The WGRT hopes to identify funding such as an FGDC CAP grant to develop a tool that would allow local governments to easily translate their centerline data from their schema to the new state schema. The translation would allow field conversions from text to integers, combining or splitting fields and other table manipulations. It is the hope of the WGRT that this translation process would also include verification of the standards topology requirements and provide local government data providers with a QC report of errors. The WGRT recognizes that any tool developed for local governments would be free to all local governments and not vendor specific.

There were numerous questions about the report. Chad asked about a situation where a road crosses over another feature but the arc is not broken because the two features literally do not connect, i.e., an overpass over a road. Alex will call Chad after the meeting and clarify the question and try to answer it. Chad also asked about local government maintenance of centerline attribute ID's and the level of commitment required. Alex acknowledged that this is tricky and a key to the success of the effort. The expectation is that the statewide centerline file will ultimately be of such value to local governments that the maintenance effort will be worth it.

Tom asked Alex to describe the value of the state centerline data to local governments. Alex provided several examples. Local government transit systems are currently using commercial centerline data, acquired at a cost to the county, to support various routing applications. The commercial datasets are frequently out-of-date and inaccurate. The state wide database, as envisioned, will be built on the county's street centerline data and, if configured to meet the standard proposed by the WGRT, can be used to support routing applications. The another benefit is that DOT will load unique IDs representing attributes for Dot data for pavement management, mile markers and other information that will be valuable to local governments. A third benefit is that once the translator tool is functional, DOT will be able to generate a report on the county dataset indicating how the county data matches the schema. This QC result can be provided to the county and will help them clean up their own data.

Gene asked which routing applications to which Alex was referring. Alex mentioned route Match and the TeleAtlas Data Model.

Chad noted that the county CAD system would benefit greatly from the data for network routing.

Julie noted that the WGRT had received high praise from GICC Chair Lee Mandell for their work and she echoed Dr. Mandell's remarks. Tom also echoed the praise, noting that the committee's work was a perfect example of how the coordination process is supposed to work, the GIS community across the state – local, state, federal – working together to address a common concern. Tom noted that the current WGRT includes about 20 local government representatives. Alex noted that the committee that developed the initial transportation standard only had 2 local government representatives.

Julie asked what the WGRT wanted from the LGC. Alex was unsure about the process forward but that he expected the standard would be presented to the GICC for adoption in November. Tom reported that based on past experience the GICC would ask if the LGC, the SGUC and other committees had vetted the standard and approved it. Tom noted that the PowerPoint presentation was useful but that the LGC would eventually need to review a written standard. Alex asked if that could be done by email or would the LGC have to meet. Julie responded that with the help of the A Team, the review could be accomplished by email and the LGC could vote by email.

Surveyor's Committee

Alex reported that the committee had not met since the last LGC meeting. The questions prepared by the LGC for the Attorney General's office regarding jurisdictional issues for collecting data without surveyor oversight were submitted to the LGC. The questions will be repackaged before being submitted to the Attorney General.

Alex noted that another question had arisen. Metropolitan Planning Organizations or MPOs are often located organizationally within the lead city in a region but have responsibility for transportation planning for the region. The MPO employees are technically city employees, yet they may be collecting data for areas outside the jurisdiction of the city. Chad said this example fits the description of the MPO that covers Brunswick County.

Tom asked if the LGC needed to send this question to Tim Johnson to be added to the list. Alex thought that it would be covered by the existing questions but that maybe Tim should be familiar with this example.

Action Item – Tom will share this information with Tim.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2009

Since the time was past 4:00, Julie asked whether anyone had any quick comments about this item. Tom reported that one of the internal CGIA goals in their role as staff to the GICC was to help implement best practices by the various coordination committees to enhance their effectiveness. One way to do that is to prepare a simple plan of work that includes short and long term actions that address issues of concern to the local government GIS community. The actions should be well-defined, attainable and tracked by the committee. Tom suggested that the LGC revisit this issue at its next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Alex suggested that the LGC prepare a letter of appreciation to Zsolt Nagy, CGIA Coordination Program Manager, who just announced that he is leaving state government. The LGC members agreed and Julie suggested that Alex prepare the letter. Tom indicated that if the LGC wanted to get the letter to him before he left it would have to be fast as his last day is Aug 31. Alex said he could do it that fast.

Action Item – Tom will provide some information about Zsolt’s career to Alex, who will craft the letter for LGC review.

Tom was asked if the LGC minutes could be provided to the A Team.

Action Item – Tom will assure that the new A Team receives the minutes, either by email or through a link to the web site.

NEXT MEETING

The next LGC meeting is scheduled for Thursday December 3.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.