

Geographic Information Coordinating Council
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

January 22, 2013
1:00 to 2:00 PM
OITS
3700 Wake Forest Road
Conference Room 4

MINUTES

Attending: Lee Mandell, Bob Brinson, Sarah Porper, George Bakolia, Ryan Draughn, John Farley, Tim Johnson, Julie Stamper, Jeff Brown, and on the phone Linda Rimer and Colleen Sharpe

Action items from this meeting:

- Lee will make revisions to the draft legislative agenda based on today's discussion and send the list to Tim to begin a process of sharing with the State Chief Information Officer.
- Tim will review the GIS Study to see if there are estimates of state government expenditures on GIS related technology and staff.
- CGIA will collaborate with the Secretary of State's Office and SMAC to revisit the process for identifying, changing, and monitoring changes in objectionable names in geographic information.
- Tim will contact the realtors association about interest in serving on the GICC as a House appointment to fill the seat vacated by Kelly Laughton.

1. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting [Lee] -- approved

2. Quick Updates

a. RoI Project [Joe] -- Tim reported briefly to confirm that the project is proceeding with input from state agencies about requirements and results from the Lenoir County pilot project for the Interagency Leadership Team. Completion will be in March.

b. NC Orthoimagery Program [Tim] – There are two projects in process concurrently. The Coastal 2012 project team has scheduled meetings to delivery orthoimagery products to the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs). The first will occur on January 29 in Wilmington for four southeastern counties, followed by sessions in Columbia, Edenton, and New Bern during the third week in February. Tim expects minimal comments from local governments since PSAPs and other local government representatives had the opportunity for local review using the online tool leading to early resolution of quality issues.

The Eastern Piedmont 2013 project is underway (including the Triangle area, Fort Bragg, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Contracts with four imagery acquisition vendors were signed on December 18, and the project kick-off occurred on December 19. Flight planning has been underway, and flight plans will be finalized soon. Flights begin on February 1, weather permitting, and continue through March. Tim plans to report to the 911 Board on Friday.

Lee asked if the projects get easier as the 4-year cycle proceeds. Tim responded that the contracting process gets easier with experience, but that the varying regions of North Carolina present new challenges for photogrammetric processes with each phase (e.g., terrain, soil types, forest types, etc.). The procurement process involved the same steps and documents. The same contractors from 2012 were selected for 2013.

c. ArcGIS Online for Organizations (AGOL, Esri) [John] -- There will be some changes in March in ArcGIS software. There will be full support for metadata in AGOL. NC Emergency Management and the Wildlife Resources Commission are looking at purchasing their own sites from Esri (landing page and administrative capability for user accounts). AGOL is a good tool for an agency without a lot of funding and staff.

d. EPA Project [Jeff] -- Jeff reported progress on the process for procuring a vendor for application development for the grant project. On the topic of EPA grant administration:

- CGIA has registered with the Exchange Network for access to reusable resources and for registering test and production information with EPA. A selected Vendor will do the same later.
- CGIA updated the Quality Assurance Report for the grant. The next semi-annual report is due in April.

Regarding procurement:

- CGIA/PMO worked with ITS Legal, Procurement and Architecture on standard terms and conditions for the RFP. The ITS staff assigned to this project provided early review and comments and will continue to be involved in the project through the procurement process.
- The RFP went to Procurement for review on January 17. Review includes Enterprise Project Management Office, Legal, Architecture and Procurement. After approval, it will be issued. Target end of this week.
- Vendors registered with ITS will receive a notice, including the Environmental Council of States (a Node resource distribution point that will notify its constituents).
- Evaluation process will begin after RFP issuance.

After the RFP is issued (within a week):

- Receipt of Vendor questions and posting of responses
- Vendor proposals received by ITS
- Proposal evaluations (mid-to-late February)
- Best and Final Offer and Contract Negotiations if needed
- Contract Award (March expected)

Looking ahead, Tom Morgan will give a presentation on the EPA Grant Project at the NC GIS Conference on Thursday, February 7, at 1:30. Tom will include a slide with contact information for the Procurement Officer for this project (Tim Lassiter).

In reply to a question from Julie, Jeff confirmed that the Working Group for Seamless Parcels reactivated and will be involved when a vendor is engaged this spring.

3. New NC CIO [discussion] -- The new State Chief Information Officer is Mr. Chris Estes. He has been on job for two weeks. George pointed out that he has dual roles: CIO and head of the department (Information Technology Services). Tim met with Chris on January 18 (as he is doing with all of the department heads) for a briefing about CGIA and the GICC. Chris agreed to speak briefly during lunch at the NC GIS Conference on Friday, February 8. It will be a good opportunity for Chris to meet a lot of people related to geospatial technology and understand the extent of collaboration in NC.

4. Colleen Sharpe retirement -- Colleen plans to retire from her GIS position with the City of Raleigh effective March 1. Colleen will take a month off and then work part-time with City of Raleigh Public Facilities, at least for a year.

Ryan explained that the NC League of Municipalities appointed Colleen to the GICC. His understanding is that if Colleen is an employee of the City (even part-time) and she is still willing to serve, that she could continue to serve. Colleen confirmed that she would like to continue to serve as a member. Ryan will pursue this with the League. Colleen confirmed that she is willing to continue as TAC chair and she pointed out that she intends to work for at least a year and that this will provide a good transition period.

5. Legislative Issues [Lee]

a. 2013 GICC Legislative Agenda

Lee shared a draft of items that he sees as GICC issues for the 2013 legislative session.

1. Conforming changes to GICC enabling statutes required by special provisions in the FY2009-10 budget bill. (As included in 2011 session's HB152).
2. Addition of the Executive Directors of the NC 911 Board and the NC Board of Elections as permanent Council members. (As included in 2011 session's HB152)
3. Addition of the Secretary of the Department of Cultural Resources (to represent State Archives) as a permanent Council member.
4. Restoration of full Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (CGIA) funding from the IT Fund for FY2013-14 and FY2014-15 to \$740,000 per year, after cuts totaling 38%. Lee clarified that \$740,000 was the funding amount for the first two years, before the reductions. The level is now \$461,871.

5. Commitment for a long-term, appropriations-independent, non-reverting, and potentially growing funding source to fund:
 - CGIA legislatively mandated responsibilities and the meeting the needs of an increasing number of GIS users and applications in the public and private sectors
 - NC OneMap (the State’s GIS database) operations, maintenance, and growth
 - The acquisition and update of key geo-spatial data layers
 - Support for the GICC and its initiatives through CGIA
 - Enhanced GIS support for local governments

George advised that “non-reverting” is better stated as “recurring” in number 5 to better capture the concept of sustainable funding.

These items will need to be reviewed by the SCIO. Sarah advised sitting down with OSBM to review the items after the SCIO. She advised that showing return on investment is very important (what are the benefits of restoring \$280,000 to CGIA).

The order of these items is shown as the least challenging to the most challenging. Bob suggested that it may be better to list in the order of importance or impact, with the less controversial ones at end of the list. The sooner these items get attention, the better. Lee will make revisions and send the list to Tim to get going with the SCIO.

b. New administration and legislature

Lee pointed out that there are many new players and new goals and strategies. There is a need to find out how we fit and who might be champions of geospatial technology and collaboration. The committee discussed the current situation and had several suggestions.

Sarah and George confirmed that there is a new standing subcommittee on information technology for appropriations. The chair is Representative Jason Saine. Representative Joe Tolson, a GIS advocate, is vice chair. Lee reminded the group that Representative Tillis understands the technology.

George added that, in the big picture, citizens need to see government as one entity. Bob pointed out that Chris Estes wants to see how IT projects impact multiple departments (intersection of functions and departments); in our case, how does the GIS and NC OneMap create benefits for business processes from an enterprise perspective? We need to find opportunities to present information to leaders in a unified way in that context. Business objectives, budget, and enterprise perspective are key concepts. It is not yet clear who in the Governor’s Office would be the best contact or what the SCIO role will be in the administration.

Sarah asked if we know how much money is spent on GIS across state agencies (as part of IT spending). Tim will check the GIS Study for numbers, if any. It would be useful to be able to describe the magnitude, and to describe the return on investment and how we deliver citizen

services. There are some numbers available for some projects, e.g., in the imagery projects (911 pays less for a statewide approach than paying for individual county projects).

Estimating savings can be challenging. John pointed out that NCDOT would use the best available data (e.g., imagery) without the statewide program; the value of the statewide imagery is related to consistency, currency, and time savings. Colleen and Julie added that there is value in having current imagery in emergency operations, particularly in coastal areas. NC OneMap as a single point of access has value to citizens and to state agency users. NC OneMap is a government presentation of information coming from multiple agencies that fits the concept of a single portal.

On the topic of nc.gov, Tim has met with Lois (who is coordinating design of nc.gov) to talk about extending the current mapping function that CGIA created for nc.gov. Sarah urged finding ways that NC OneMap could help small businesses and NC Commerce, and to support multiple agencies with geospatial data, including the master address database. Bob confirmed that the Governor wants to be sure that emergency response is coordinated and comprehensive. John added that NCDOT is emphasizing customer service, and imagery certainly fits that intention.

Tim's hour with Chris Estes included emphasis on agency collaboration and benefits to citizens. Chris asked Tim to boil down the Executive Summary of the GICC Annual Report to one or two pages.

6. Other Items from Group

Ryan Draughn asked for guidance from M&O about an issue that arose recently. The background, in brief: a transportation project in Union County involved a stream that had an objectionable name that was changed to "Salem Creek" sometime after 2004 (when it was identified in a process led by the GICC and the Secretary of State's Office in response to legislation in 2003). It came to the attention of Representative Alexander (from Mecklenburg County) that there were maps in use that still contained the objectionable name. Representative Alexander contacted NCDOT to inquire. NCDOT did research on stream databases and found the some but not all datasets had updated all stream segments to be named "Salem Creek." Tim added that the GICC sent letters to county managers in several counties in 2004 to point out the objectionable names. It is not clear what monitoring occurred regarding local databases, or federal and state databases. Checking the national Geographic Names Information System, some of the names identified in 2004 have been changed, and some have not. The process of official name changes for geographic features involves a local request to the NC Board on Geographic Names (NC BGN, under the Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee chaired by Ryan), research and analysis by the NC BGN, a recommendation to the US BGN, and approval by US BGN.

Ryan pointed out that SMAC cannot enforce data updates after objectionable names are changed. And SMAC cannot submit a request for a name change directly; local involvement is essential for the process. Ryan consulted Tom Morgan to find the 2003 legislation. Ryan would like guidance on moving forward to avoid other problems related to geographic names.

The GICC has the responsibility to notify a county to point out an objectionable name and to get a county response. Lee suggested following up to find out if geographic databases have been changed. John explained that mistakes in updating data (e.g., not every segment of a long streams gets a name change which appears to be the case for Salem Creek) or legacy datasets that are derived from primary sources, or annotation that is derived from a dataset and is managed separately (missing an update in source data), or historic maps (that should not be changed) may come into play.

There are two issues: (1) names that were officially changed but have not been updated in all geographic datasets, and (2) names that have not been changed, needing a local process to initiate a name change request.

Julie pointed out that the Stream Mapping Advisory Committee is a group that intended to research names to identify problems related to both cases.

Ryan suggested that there are opportunities to communicate the name changing process, and to communicate name changes for data managers to integrate in their datasets. The name changing process is not well known in local and state governments. And notification needs to be comprehensive. John confirmed that, for a few name changes per year (a dozen at most) it would be practical to carry out an annual method to publish and notify.

Lee concluded that:

- information efforts and outreach on the process could be coordinated with Tom Morgan's office,
- publication of the changes should be systematic, and
- follow-up is needed to confirm that changes in datasets are accomplished.

In any case, the GICC is responsible. The 2004 approach was to notify local governments with requests to change specific names. The process needs to be revisited and modified to achieve these three objectives.

As a final item from the group, Tim pointed out that the M&O Committee needs to come up with a recommendation to Senator Berger's office for a person to replace Kelly Laughton on the GICC. Someone from the private sector would be appropriate to replace Kelly. The real estate / development community could use another representative (in addition to John Gillis). There may be other industries that could contribute, for example, environmental consulting or photogrammetry. Lee suggested that Tim make a call to the realtors association to inquire about interest.

7. Future Meetings [Mondays from 1:00 to 3:00 including the Governance Committee meeting]
 - a. Feb 18
 - b. Mar 18
 - c. Apr 15
 - d. May 20