



North Carolina
Geographic Information Coordinating Council
• Local Government Committee

MINUTES
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
December 3, 2009

PROCEEDINGS

The quarterly meeting of the Local Government Committee (LGC), a committee of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC), was held on December 3, 2009.

PRESENT

LGC members:

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

Others:

James Armstrong, Richmond County, LGC rep to the SMAC
Jeff Brown, CGIA (for part of meeting)
Anne Payne, Wake County (for part of meeting)
Tom Tribble, CGIA, Staff to the LGC

ABSENT

None

REVIEW OF APPOINTMENTS

Julie Stamper thanked the LGC for naming new A Team appointments. Julie noted that the group has several new members and promises to be very responsive but she requested

that LGC members be proactive in ensuring that A Team members respond to requests. She noted that Jason Mann was appointed to the TAC and Matt Hayes was appointed to the Stream Mapping Advisory Committee. Also, until now the Working Group for Orthophotography Planning has not had a local government committee representation and with statewide ortho project gearing up, we felt that it was important to have local government representation on that committee. Steve Randone from Brunswick County and a former LGC member agreed to serve. Julie noted that as current PMA President, and member of the PMA ortho standards committee, Steve is well qualified to serve and has already been attending meetings.

Julie announced that more than 40 local government members serve on various GICC committees and that it is exciting to have that level of involvement by the local government community.

STATEWIDE ORTHO PROJECT

(Note – the Statewide Ortho Project topic was moved up from its original place on the agenda because Anne Payne was not able to join the meeting until about 2:30.)

Julie introduced Jeff Brown from CGIA. Jeff Brown is working on the statewide ortho project.

Jeff reported that CGIA is managing the statewide ortho project. The plan is capture orthos using digital cameras in 2010 for every county in NC. Upon delivery, each county will receive the data on a hard drive, including TIFF files as well as compressed MR SID imagery, metadata files and index files. The data will be delivered to the GIS contacts in the county but since the project is funded by the NC 911 Board it is important that the data be provided to the 911 contacts in each county.

Not all the contracts with photogrammetry service providers have been signed but this will happen in the next week or so. The statewide project team is looking for advice on one topic. One of the deliverables will be a county mosaic of the compressed imagery. The project team would like to know how many counties are using mosaics and will need compressed imagery and consequently what compression ration should be used to give a balance between detail and performance.

James Armstrong reported that he uses SDE to manage his county imagery but he does get requests for the data from contractors, foresters and others and the only thing he can give them are mosaics so they do come in handy. Jeff asked what compression ration he uses. James was unsure. Jerry Simmons reported that Pender County was a partner on a recently completed 6-county ortho project and every county received the MR SID mosaic. He noted that Pender County posted the data on the county GIS web site. Some county staff need the imagery when they go out into the field. In addition the county also distributes the data to outside users and the mosaic is useful for that. Pender County uses a 50:1 compression ration but the ratio could vary by county depending on the size of the county. A small county could get away with a larger ratio but for Pender County the 50:1

was chosen because the county data would fit on a DVD. Jeff asked about the performance at 50:1 ratio. Jerry reported that the performance is good and that the clarity is still good for the most part.

Jerry asked if the flight will be at 1" = 200' scale and in true color. Jeff replied that it will be digitally captured at a 6" pixel resolution which is equivalent to the 200' scale mapping. Jeff noted that the SMAC's advice is that for individual files that are compressed they be at 20:1 ratio but for the mosaic that may be too large to fit a DVD. Jerry reported that the individual files were at 20:1 and the county-wide mosaic was at 50:1.

Chris Koltyk noted that we are discussing 2 things. First, with the mosaic the compression can be much greater than for individual tiles. For individual tiles, you need to have much less compression. For imagery that you share with customers, you can compress it at a smaller ratio so it will fit on 4.7 GB DVD or make ortho available for download on a tile by tile basis. He added that what is most important is to have it lossless.

Jeff says that 20:1 ratio for lossless MR SID tiles is consistent with the SMAC recommendations. But for the mosaic, I guess you are suggesting, Chris, that whatever compression ratio is used, if it doesn't fit on a DVD that will be awkward. Chris responded saying that DVD is the most popular and works for most users. If it for a GPS user, we don't typically check out the entire county. This is more of a case-by-case basis.

Tom asked that Jeff confirm that the data will be available for download from NC OneMap. Jeff said that is the plan so counties could point people to that as an option. CGIA will be looking at the current protocols to see if they can be improved or made faster. There are some funds for investment in NC OneMap so that we can make it as functional as possible.

Kat Clifton reported that the Rowan county imagery is stored as 20:1 for individual tiles and 50:1 for the county mosaic. At 50:1 compression, putting a mosaic on a TF card works well for mobile applications on laptops or for data collection with a GPS instead of taking small portions of the imagery. This works better because invariably where you happen to end up is right off the end of the map. Jeff asked if it performs well at 50:1 and Kat responded absolutely. Jeff noted that Rowan is a pretty big county.

Julie reported that in the NE almost no county uses mosaics, rather they use individual tiles. Currituck is the only county with the ability to create MR SID files. Generally they accept whatever the state provides through the NC OneMap download or on hard drives. Jeff thanked the group and said that the information is very helpful. Tom asked if Jeff needs more information from the local government community or is the info from the LGC members sufficient. Chris suggested that we send out an email to the list serves with the questions that Jeff asked the LGC members. That will make everyone feel included. Otherwise some will feel that they were excluded. Tom reported that we have a mechanism for doing that – the LGC Alert. We can send the LGC Alert email with the

list of questions to the various list serves and ask that they respond to Jeff Brown. Julie asked if we should limit it to the A Team since it seems that most of the LGC had the same advice. Tom suggested that Chris has a good point and that by sending it to the list servs, no one can say that they didn't get a chance. Julie agreed.

Action Item – Tom will prepare a LGC Alert message and send it to Gene, Julie, Jerry and Chris for distribution to the respective list servs.

Jeff also noted that uncompressed, individual TIFFS would be about 600 MB apiece and wondered who uses the TIFF files, internally, and do you get requests externally for the uncompressed files. Chris responded that if you want to load imagery into your server for internal applications, you want to use TIFFs but he has never received a single request for a TIFF file.

Jerry also noted that some engineers and surveyors that are doing site plans may occasionally request TIFFs. Julie said that she may get the same requests from surveyors for TIFF files. She also noted that in-house it is easier to use TIFFs because with MR SID you create too many temporary files and it is a lot of trouble to clear them out. Gene Hume reported that in Buncombe County they load the TIFFs into SDE. Occasionally they get requests for TIFFs but the requests typically disappear when they learn that there will be a slight fee for the TIFF files while the MR SID files are free at the county download site. Chris reports that exact same thing.

Gene asked about the QA /AC process. Jeff reported that a 3rd party contractor, identified through the FMP program quality-based selection process, will do the QA /QC. That contractor will only do the QA / QC and not any of the data acquisition. Jeff noted that he did not have the specs as yet. Gene asked if they would have an opportunity to look at the specs. Jeff said he would find the answer.

Chris suggested that Gary Thompson be involved; that Gary had done the horizontal control for Moore County's previous projects. Julie asked if the new standard would be in play.

Jeff said yes, the new GICC supported digital standard would apply but he also noted that there are 2 quality control steps. He was originally referring to the visual QC but the other part is the horizontal QC. Gary will engage one or more independent contractors for the horizontal control and Gary's staff will be involved to some extent. Tom noted that Gary and his staff will not do the actual QC themselves, as they may have done for individual counties previously, because the project is for 100 counties. That is why contractors will be engaged but ultimately it will be Gary's stamp of approval on the horizontal control. Jeff will see how we can engage either the LGC or at least the Ortho working group in the review of the specs.

Action Item – Tom will work with Jeff to determine how to distribute the QA / QC specs.

Julie asked if the Ortho web site had been updated. Jeff said no, that one question had been added to the FAQs but that until the contracts are signed there was not much new to add. Tom noted that Chris had seen Kelly Laughton and asked her if counties could still use NC 911 money to support the acquisition of orthos 2 years from now. The answer to this question is yes. It would still fall under the normal rules that you can only use 911 money every 4 years but according to Richard Taylor of the 911 Board, this particular project will not keep counties from using 911 money according to their planned schedule. Chris just wanted to confirm that in 2 or 3 years counties will not have to justify using NC 911 money to support reevaluation, which is on a set schedule. Tom noted that Richard Taylor answered this question in the affirmative but Tom couldn't guarantee that they wouldn't change their mind. Jeff noted that the question is 3.10 on the FAQs.

Julie wondered if we shouldn't send out the ortho project web link maybe every month or two. Tom said we would do this when the LGC Alert goes out and that it would be a good idea to remind the community on a regular basis.

Tom asked Jeff about the schedule. Jeff replied that flights will start in January and that delivery of products would begin no earlier than late December 2010 and probably more likely into the winter and early spring of 2011 because of the volume of data.

DEPT of REVENUE REQUEST FOR TAX DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Julie asked Anne Payne to bring the LGC up-to-date on the Department of Revenue's request to counties for tax district boundaries. Anne noted that Wake County had received two letters, the first from Duke Energy requesting shape files or autocad format for tax districts. A few days later, they received essentially the same request from the Department of Revenue (DOR)

As a local government person, Anne was disturbed by this because the request does not fit with the Council's data sharing recommendations and yet a DOR appointee sits on the Council and presumably would have been aware of the recommendations. Not everyone would have received the request from Duke Energy because their service area does not cover all counties. Anne checked with the Wake County assessor, who knew very little about the request. Anne called the DOR contact, but he was not very knowledgeable about the technical details. Anne noted that the requests did not follow the Council's data sharing recommendations. The letter specifically asked that counties not suggest that DOR go to the county web site and download the data. The DOR contact explained to Anne that this was because that data from different counties would be in different formats. Anne pointed out to him that the letter did not specify a format. DOR mixed up references to maps and shapefiles and clearly did not understand that shapefiles do not have labels or legends.

Anne noted that DOR was not aware that Duke Energy was sending out duplicated requests and DOR did put a stop to that. Anne noted that the requests generated significant traffic on the NC GIS list serv. Anne was concerned from the standpoint of

the GICC and her role as former chair of the Data Sharing Committee. Anne suggests that the issue be raised at the GICC so that similar situations don't come up in the future. Julie asked if everyone got the letter and indicated that she did not. Gene got it and had the same question about annotation and labels. Jerry and Chris did not get it. Anne suggested that the Duke Energy letter went to the Assessor's Office so that might explain it. The DOR letter went to the GIS person.

Julie asked what we can do. It seems that DOR is unaware of the GICC policies and does not understand the technical issues. Anne wanted to bring it to the LGC since local governments would be most affected by the requests. Julie suggested that DOR support a new committee – the seamless tax district committee. Tom acknowledged the frustrations of everyone but also recognized that the DOR council member was probably not directly involved in the request and may have been unaware of it. We shouldn't be surprised that it happened.

Tom suggested that we look on this as an opportunity for education and for the GICC to work with DOR to address the concern. There is the possibility of a committee, as Julie suggests, to address this. There is the possibility to use NC OneMap as a solution if counties can serve tax data to NC OneMap. We don't know DOR's time deadlines and it seems unlikely that the GICC can solve this before DOR needs the data. But we should say that we missed an opportunity here and let's see how we can go forward.

Julie agreed and asked how we go forward. Anne indicated that she had spoken to Tim Johnson, who she expects will raise the issue with GICC chair Lee Mandell and perhaps initiate a discussion with DOR. Anne indicated that she just wanted to make sure that the LGC was aware of it since the requests flies in the face of the Council adopted recommendations that arose out of the LGC concerns several years ago.

Julie noted that DOR is visiting counties and asking directly for the data. Anne noted that the DOR staff acknowledged that they don't have GIS software and expected to pass the data directly to the utility companies.

Tom raised the question of what the utility companies planned to do with the data. Anne and Julie replied that it will help the utility company accurately list their property value in the correct tax district within the county so that the county can accurately collect taxes. Julie asked if the situation is not similar to the one involving DMV and the effort to get address databases from county assessors where only local assessors are allowed to apply assessments to tax payers. Julie was told that utility companies could use their own software to determine in which tax districts they own property and could be sure that they are correctly paying their taxes. Anne noted that everyone's motives are pure – the goal is to maximize tax collection by the counties. The question is whether the method of acquiring and sharing GIS data could be more effective.

Tom asked if Julie is comfortable regarding how to address this at Council meeting. Julie suggested that the topic could be discussed between now and the Feb Council, perhaps involving Tim, Anne, Lee and others.

REPORTS

SMAC

James Armstrong provided the SMAC report, acknowledging that Chad Ives compiled it. James noted that the October meeting was his first SMAC meeting.

Tim Johnson reported that the GICC would be submitting a letter to the Attorney General's office seeking an advisory opinion on questions raised by the LGC about the authority for local governments to collect data for other local governments. The Technical Advisory Committee will be looking at refreshing NC OneMap. Jason Mann, the LGC rep on the TAC can report in more detail on that.

James noted that the state is renegotiating the Enterprise License Agreement (ELA) with ESRI before it concludes in 2010 and is looking to include local governments in those negotiations.

Gary Thompson and the Working Group on Ortho Planning is working on standards for collecting oblique imagery and hopes to have a report by the January SMAC meeting.

NC DOT is updating the roads characteristics for the road layer that DOT maintains and anticipates the development of a route layer with 137 attributes. DOT is receiving requests for updates to the Integrated State Roads Network and would like letters of support from local governments for this effort.

James also noted that Tom Morgan reported at the SMAC that Department of Revenue was requesting that counties provide county and municipal boundary data because those boundaries affect tax rates for utility-owned properties. Julie noted that this is obviously the same issue the LGC discussed earlier today. Apparently it was not made clear at the SMAC meeting that DOR would be requesting more than just the county and municipal boundaries. James reported that the SMAC requested that the LGC consider a strategy for collection boundary data. Anne reported that this arose at the end of a long and busy SMAC meeting and did not get much play.

Tom noted and Julie confirmed that DOR raised the issue, at least very briefly, at the fall PMA meeting as well. It seems that DOR was at least putting out hints as to where they were heading but perhaps not in a way that the GIS community clearly understood.

Tom had one question about the DOT report. What is the Integrated State Roads Network and will the data and attributes be available for download from the DOT site? James was unsure and thinks they are just developing it but thinks it will be available for download. Alex Rickard reported that the ISRN was about 2 years old – a statewide centerline file made up of both state and local centerline data and that it is a bear to create. DOT is asking for some support so that the GIS staff can devote time to updating that file. Alex asked if DOT had provided a timeline on when they needed letters of

support. James indicated no. Alex confirmed that the current ISRN file is available for download on both the DOT site and NC OneMap.

Julie had a follow-up comment on the ELA status. She reported that George Bakolia stated that the state would not get into an ELA unless a multi-volume purchasing contract with the local governments is included. James noted that although the state planned to include local governments in the agreement, the state would not pay the costs for local government licenses. Julie noted that Mr. Bakolia at OITS seems to be a real champion for local government and is pro-GIS and doing everything to support local governments. Tom noted that his support is one of the benefits of CGIA's transfer to OITS.

Chris is participating on the ELA work group. Negotiations are pending and information is vague and that is about all that can be said right now. The good thing is that local governments are included in the negotiations. Chris recommends that the LGC write a letter to the State CIO saying that the LGC values Mr. Bakolia's help in promoting the use of GIS at the local level by including local governments in the negotiations for a master purchase agreement or an ELA. Chris noted that local governments don't really have leverage with ESRI and that the ELA effort is giving local governments some leverage.

Julie supported the idea of a letter. Tom indicated that the LGC could draft a letter for everyone to review. Jerry asked to whom the letter would go. Chris responded that it should go to the State CIO.

Action Item – Tom will work with Julie to draft a letter of appreciation from the LGC to Mr. Fralick, the state CIO. Julie will share it with the LGC members before sending it.

TAC

Jason Mann was not able to attend. James noted that it was reported at the SMAC meeting that the TAC will consider ArcGIS on-line and other technologies for refreshing NC OneMap.

Julie reported that Kelly gave an update at the GICC meeting on the outcomes of the first TAC meeting, which Jason did attend. The TAC is struggling with the vision of NC OneMap and needs to get consensus on that before addressing the technical architecture issues. This prompted the TAC to develop the 3 questions about NC OneMap that Tom distributed to the LGC earlier this week.

Julie strongly encouraged the TAC members to submit their answers. Tom agreed but suggested that the questions probably do not need to be addressed by the group in today's meeting but strongly encouraged the LGC members to submit their responses to Julie. Tom noted that the questions are going out to every member of the GICC and to the LGC, FIC Executive Committee, SGUC Executive Committee and the SMAC. It is very important to the TAC and to Jason, who is on the LGC rep on the TAC, that they get

good responses to the questions. Alex asked about the deadline, which is January 8. Alex asked if there would be a benefit for the group to get on the phone and discuss our responses. Julie suggested yes but she would want the answers from everyone individually first. Julie suggested that everyone get their responses to her by Dec 18. Tom suggested that the LGC could schedule a phone call the first week in January for a discussion

Chris reported that he had the opportunity to visit the OITS Western Data Center and was very impressed with the facility. He hopes that local governments may be able to take advantage of the facility perhaps to serve as backup housing for local government at some point. Julie suggested that we inform Jason Mann about this facility so that the TAC is aware of it.

Action Item – LGC members will provide answers to the TAC questions by no later than Dec 18. Julie will schedule a short phone meeting of the LGC the first week of January to review the answers and help Julie compile the LGC's response to the TAC. Tom will forward the questions to the A Team.

WGRT

The WGRT met on Oct 21 and reviewed the absolute bare requirements of the translator. The idea is to take local road centerline data and translate it into a state format for a seamless statewide street centerline database. The WGRT identified about a dozen items, which include:

- Client based or desktop based. Time and money preclude a server solution.
- Free.
- Vendor neutral.
- Ability to load in multiple schemas, not just the state standard. This will enable local governments to translate their data into other schema. For example, Jerry in Pender County could get Onslow County and load their data into his schema or GeoDatabase
- Regarding inputs, allow as many as possible but shapefiles and GML at a minimum;
- Regarding outputs, would like to have shapefiles and GML.
- A difference from the WGSP seamless parcels project would be an attribute error report that could be provided to the local government. Examples might be an address range out of order or a misspelled name.
- Translator will take an input file, translate it into the standard; generate an output file and grab the appropriate attributes and load them into the event table for the standard. For example, if local government had speed limits, number of lanes, pavement width, etc, the translator would be able to move these attributes into the event table.
- Save all the mapping configurations so that participants don't have to continually remap the fields from the input to the output.
- A deliverable would be creation of the schema definition or xsd file.

The WGRT identified a few bells and whistles that are desirable depending on contractor's ability to complete these given the funding level.

- Ability to create the xsd file from scratch so that participants could generate schema definition files for other layers;

- Ability to read in geodatabases. May be problematic.
- Ability to integrate this translator with NC StreetMap site, which is the repository for street centerline data. We have been asking local governments to upload their data to this site. One goal is once you run your data through the translator and it is put into the state format, then it would automatically be uploaded into your account at NC StreetMap and save the user the extra time to complete that step.
- WGRT reached the conclusion that the translator would not be able to verify topology and generate a topology error report. This is beyond the scope of the project.

The key differences between this project and the WGSP project on parcels is that we hope to have the ability to generate an error report, which will be useful to local governments; the ability to take the input and split it out into an output of a shapefile and the related event tables; and the ability to create a schema definition on the fly; read geodatabases; and integrate with NC StreetMap. Finally we hope to have a mini-metadata capture tool.

Alex is writing the FGDC grant application. Janet is gathering letters of support from agencies and organizations.

Tom asked about the concern between the similarity between the WGSP project and the WGRT project and whether FGDC would see that as a negative. Tom noted that the WGSP project is funded by EPA and that FGDC might not have any knowledge of that grant. Alex noted that the FGDC, especially Doug Nebert, is aware of the WGSP project but that the grant application will emphasize the differences. Tom suggested that in addition to emphasizing the differences, the application should highlight how the WGRT grant complements the WGSP project and the synergy between the two efforts.

Alex's concern is whether the translator will have the ability to read a geodatabase. He asked if your data is stored in a geodatabase or SDE and you have to convert it to a shapefile before you can use this translator, at what point does this effort become too burdensome. How critical is it that the translator be able to read a geodatabase?

Chris believes that it is important that local governments be able to use batch processes to be able to update their data. If he needs to convert a geodatabase to a shapefile and then use the translator, he wants to be able to run that process in batch overnight. Alex asked if Chris could convert into a model or Python and run it, would he be fine with that. Chris said correct. Most of his data sharing with users is through automated batch processes.

What about the step of pushing the data up to NC StreetMap. You would still have to do that as a manual process. Chris said not necessarily. We move data between agencies through batch processes. Alex hopes to add the automated upload to NC StreetMap to the translator.

SURVEYOR'S COMMITTEE

Alex had no report about the Surveyor's Committee, which has not met. Julie asked about the LGC letter about local governments supporting other local governments on data collection. Tom noted that the letter is still with the attorney.

WGSP

Julie talked to Tom Morgan, who reported that the WGSP group is basing their whole concept on local governments pushing their parcel data up to a statewide seamless database. If a local government does this, would the data fall under the rule that the state is obligated to share that data with anyone. He got an opinion from Richard Bradford with the Attorney General's Office that if the state is holding data, the state must make it available under the open records law. Some local governments are going to resist participation under this policy and this is creating a problem for the WGSP. Tom suggested that the WGSP not try to solve that but create the tool and then demonstrate over time the value of a statewide seamless parcel dataset and work over time to eliminate the concern by local governments.

Alex asked what that means for NC StreetMap because participation in NC StreetMap and access to that ftp site is restricted to governments. The public is not allowed to access it. The answer is uncertain.

GICC

Julie indicated that we have covered almost everything that was discussed at the Nov 10 GICC meeting. The complete minutes for the GICC meeting will be available at the GICC web site. Julie noted that there is one item that we have not discussed. Julie was approached by DMV/DOT for shape files and addresses because you will start paying your personal vehicle taxes through DOT instead of the local tax office. Similar to the DOR situation, they are asking for data. DOT has a representative on the GICC but this issue was not raised at the GICC initially. Julie raised this issue at the Dec GICC meeting. DOT reversed a bit and said that this is not a GIS project and that they are only asking for tabular address files. But Julie indicated that they did ask her for parcel shapefiles and felt that this effort should have been better coordinated, particularly since the effort seemed to conflict with the WGSP effort and the other efforts to develop statewide seamless datasets for various layers.

LGC WORK PLAN

Julie introduced the LGC work Plan draft. The idea is to make the LGC more effective so that all the LGC members understand their responsibilities and the committee as a whole can stay on top of things a little better. This is just a first draft and a starting point for discussion. The document will be dynamic and will involve over time. For example there are special assignments, such as Chris attending the NC 911 Board meetings so that the LGC can track its activities. Julie asked if Chris had been attending. He has attended but not recently but still plans to attend and that he and Ryan Draughn are trying to coordinate their attendance.

Chris is also down for attending the ELA Working Group meetings. Julie highlighted the regular activities. Tom asked if there are any questions.

Kat Clifton noted the two items under her name and said that she could handle those assignments but would need additional information about them.

Tom offered to review the 3 types of regular activities on the plan. Under the reports or presentations to LGC member organizations, the rationale is that a key role of the LGC member is to serve as a liaison between the GICC and their organization, as stated in the LGC bylaws. For issues that are of concern to the organization, the LGC member should bring them to the LGC, which can bring them to the Council. Conversely, the LGC member should report developments on coordination activities to their membership. This approach applies best to PMA, CURISA, NCLGISA and the COG GIS group; less so for the League of Municipalities and the Association of County Commissions. Tom noted that Chris attends the regular NCLGISA meetings and gives a short PPT presentation on coordination activities involving GIS and geospatial data. Tom typically works with Chris to prepare a PPT that Chris can use. Tom can provide similar support to other LGC members. Tom noted that for the League of Municipalities and the Association of County Commissions, the opportunities to report are not as clear and something that we would have to explore with Ryan Draughn and Rebecca Troutman. Julie noted that she had offered to do this for ACC. Julie suggested that a regular report at the PMA meeting, like the one that Chris does at NCLGISA, would go a long way toward keeping the PMA membership informed.

Chris noted that the PPT is useful. He thought that the PPT was a template for everyone to use. It covers a summary of the activities of the LGC and the GICC over the last 6 months. Chris also reports on pertinent activities at the monthly NCLGISA Board meetings and tries to listen to any concerns the NCLGISA Board has and then raise them at LGC meetings. As an example, the question about the use of NC 911 funds to support the acquisition of orthos after the statewide ortho project is complete came out of the NCLGISA meeting. He relayed that to Kelly Laughton, who asked the question at the GICC meeting. Tom noted that this is a great example. NCLGISA members raised the question to Chris, who brought it to the LGC, which brought it to the GICC and got an answer.

Tom noted that the suggested activities are not new. The idea is to put it on paper so that LGC members have an outline and are thinking about it. Tom offered his support as staff person do to some of the grunt work and relieve the burden on the LGC members.

Chris appreciates the list, which gives an overview, in writing, of everything that the LGC does. Chris notes that Ryan is not on the ELA work group. Chris suggested that we combine the NCLGISA reporting into one item.

Regarding the presentations to local users groups, Tom relayed his experience with MRGAC, the Mountain Region GIS users group. Tom typically is on the agenda to give

an update on coordination activities and issues. It can be an LGC person or it can be Tom or another CGIA staff person who does it for the LGC. It does not have to be a formal presentation but just a short regular item on the agenda. Chris said that the Sandhills group is still active. Tom said that there could be other groups of which he is unaware. Tom said that he had no idea whether Kat attended the Mecklenburg County group meetings. If there are groups that are meeting it is good to have a LGC rep or a CGIA rep to speak to them about issues that affect them. Kat noted that her GIS Analyst often attends the Mecklenburg meeting and could report. Kat also said that she would report to the local Salisbury GIS group. Tom offered whatever support he can provide and suggested that LGC members keep it informal. Julie says that is how she handles it at the Albemarle group.

The final section is on internal reports. Tom said that the LGC does a pretty good job in this area but that the LGC representatives to the various committees need to report back to the LGC on a more timely basis. Reports don't have to be formal. Email reports are fine. Tom said that he failed to ask Wright Lowery or Matt Hayes, LGC reps to the Stream Mapping Advisory committee, to report at today's LGC meeting. But we need to do that because they are representing the LGC and if issues arise that affect the local government community, then the LGC is unaware of what has been said. We will communicate with them that part of the LGC's expectations is that they will report regularly to the LGC.

Tom noted that the whole point here is to make the voice of the LGC more effective and to ensure that the LGC is aware of developments and responding appropriately. The LGC has been an incredibly effective committee over its history and this effort is simply to improve the LGC's effectiveness.

Julie suggested that we update the work plan and include the action items from this meeting and send it out to everyone. Julie said that this should be a dynamic document that tracks the action items of the LGC.

Action Item – Tom will revise the current draft, add the action items and circulate it to the LGC and its representatives. Tom will contact reps to the Stream Mapping Advisory Committee and ask them to report back to the LGC on any committee activities that affect local government.

RAMONA

Julie suggested that Ramona is not a very effective tool. She noted that there are repetitious request for information that circulate on the lists servs. Examples include - what office is GIS in? What do you charge for printing maps? What parcel attributes do you store? Who is the GIS contact? CGIA has promoted Ramona because it is a national tool but it doesn't seem to work well for North Carolina.

Julie asked if there is a different tool that could be developed. What about a Facebook concept for GIS? Do the rest of you have issues with Ramona? It seems to be difficult to

get people to go back to Ramona on a regular basis? Jerry asked if it could be a Google Groups tool because Facebook is blocked in his county. Julie is just thinking about a better tool, not necessarily Facebook. She asked how people would find out who the GIS contact person in Jones county. One response was to Google it; another was to call Jones County. Julie asked what about the regular requests every 6 months for information like map printing costs. Is there not a way to capture that information instead of someone asking and everyone replying in a random way? In the end you don't really have good information.

Tom acknowledged that Ramona was not as effective as it could be and understands Julie's frustration about the repetitive questions. Tom noted that Julie pulled together a summary about charges for maps. Perhaps that summary could be posted on the GICC/LGC web site. The web site could include a section with general information such as a spread sheet that summarizes of data on charging for maps. Then the next time the question appears, a LGC member can respond to the list serv and refer to the GICC/LGC web site. What that requires is that someone compile the information, whatever it is. Tom noted that CGIA has a list of the county GIS contacts. Maybe there are a half dozen items that the LGC could address, perhaps by appointing some volunteer subcommittees. It wouldn't have to be the 6 members of the LGC. Julie hoped that CGIA could do the work. Tom said that he could do the work on the GIS contacts but perhaps not on what counties are charging for maps. Tom said that he could perhaps pull together the GIS location by county. By posting the information on the GICC/LGC web site, it might encourage more traffic and help to inform the local government community about coordination activities.

Julie noted that using Survey Monkey to survey counties on charging for maps was pretty easy but there is a cost for the professional grade Survey Monkey that allows one to publish that information a bit easier. Julie asked if CGIA could pay for that. Tom reported that CGIA does have a Survey Monkey license and thinks it may be the professional version. Perhaps the LGC could approach CGIA and ask that CGIA do a survey on a particular item – map charges for example – and then publish the results to the web site. Tom cannot volunteer right now but the legislative changes that occurred this year may enable CGIA to take on more of these kinds of tasks. Julie asked if she should bring it to the Council. Tom suggested that we initiate this at staff level, perhaps taking it to Tim Johnson first.

Action Item – Tom and Julie will draft a plan to address this issue and raise it with the CGIA Coordination Team.

OTHER BUSINESS

Julie brought up one additional item – the LUCA update. Julie noted that almost every county was getting a long list of addresses that the Census Bureau had rejected. For example, Brunswick County had 11,000 addresses rejected. Census Bureau is not

providing answers as to why. PMA has a committee that is dealing with this. Does the LGC need to get involved?

Gene reported that is a big issue in Buncombe County as well. He noted that every time he submitted something to the Census Bureau, they responded with 2 more requests. The tools for dealing with the addresses did not work well. Julie asked if we should be concerned with this because the Master Address dataset that CGIA created was supposed to help solve the problem.

Chris reported that Moore County is in the same boat and had about 2,500 addresses rejected. He is trying to get as many addresses verified as possible. Counties have to deal with this right now on a case by case basis and he suggested that it may be too late for the LGC to solve anything for the 2010 census.

Julie asked if Tom had any ideas. Tom said that it would have been nice if the General Assembly had provided ongoing funding so that there was a way to update addresses but given the budget situation that did not happen. Jerry noted that it may be difficult to change things at this point because the Census Bureau's process probably can't be changed.

Tom suggested that with the census scheduled for April 1, it might be difficult for the LGC to take any action right now. But perhaps the GICC could invite representatives of the Census Bureau to attend a GICC meeting after the census is completed and talk about all of their issues – addresses, roads, political boundaries. There will be 10 years before the next census; we're in the digital age; NC is making progress on developing statewide seamless datasets for a variety of layers. Why can't the GICC collaborate more effectively with the Census Bureau for 2020? Perhaps Julie can raise this idea at the next Council meeting.

James asked if the dates for the 2010 LGC dates had been set. Tom sent them out to the LGC members but had not sent them to the LGC reps. The meetings will be moved to Wednesday to accommodate Kat's teaching schedule. Tom will distribute the new dates to the LGC reps.

NEXT MEETING

The next LGC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 24, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.