

Geographic Information Coordinating Council
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

February 17, 2014

1:00 to 2:00 PM

OITS

3700 Wake Forest Road

Conference Room 4

MINUTES

1. Stan welcomed Dee Hill, Bob Brinson, Sarah Porper, John Farley, and Jeff Brown, and on the phone, Kathryn Clifton, Ryan Draughn, and Bob Coats

2. Approval of Minutes of the January 21st Meeting; approved as submitted.

3. Quick Updates

a. Working Group for Census Geospatial Data

Bob Coats, Chair of the working group, joined the meeting to report that the working group is getting organized. Its initial meeting focused on needs of the many stakeholders regarding addressing and geographic data. There are three main categories of interest: addressing, boundary issues, and local government participation in defining sub-county geographies for data reporting. Regarding address data, there are several state agencies working with address lists. The goal is to centralize efforts and develop a product that will more efficiently meet state needs and the needs of the Census Bureau. The working group members have a lot of energy and experience to share. The group will identify overlap among state agencies and define standard products. More discussions produce more detail, the group will work toward a dynamic, robust, valuable resource.

The working group member from the Census Geography Unit is Brian Timko, serving in a technical role. He is very interested in meeting NC people in person. John suggested that having Brian meet with the working group, not the policy oriented GICC, would be most valuable. Stan added that he has had conversations with Tim Trainor (head of the geography unit) and suggested that there may be an opportunity for Mr. Trainor to address the GICC as early as the May meeting. Also, Bob Coats will meet with Census Bureau staff in Washington, DC in early March and take the opportunity to brief Brian and confirm our interest in having Brian visit, perhaps in March. Bob may also have an opportunity to check Tim Trainor's schedule.

John Farley added that the Federal Highway Administration (represented by Tim Ross), in collaboration with the Census Bureau, is interested in working with NC as a pilot state for centerlines, and also expressed interest in addressing and parcel datasets. There may be opportunities for collaboration with the working group. Bob Coats pointed out that Joe Sewash and CGIA are participating in the test program (Geographic Support System (GSS) initiative) that includes address data. Bob confirmed that Brian was very excited about GSS and state data. Standards and formatting are essential for all.

Bob emphasized the value of a central location for data access for the Census, along with the need to respect the wishes of local governments (managers of authoritative data) that may prefer direct data

sharing with the Census. The state resource will back up local governments who do not choose direct reporting.

In summary, Bob appreciated great conversations and ideas for coordinating data requests to local government data managers. The group is asking: what else would you need in an address database to support business processes and core missions? Bob acknowledged that a central resource may not meet 100 percent of each stakeholder's needs, but the working group will determine what can meet the majority of needs for stakeholders.

Regarding participation on the working group, Ryan confirmed that SMAC could appoint another person to the working group (SMAC members John Farley and Tom Morgan are already representing their agencies). Commerce has been added to the working group (person to be identified). There is local government participation (including David Nash of the City of Fayetteville representing the Local Government Committee).

John emphasized expected benefits that are clearly measurable, particularly related to address verification (to save money on mailings). Bob added that commercial addresses could be valuable for economic development purposes.

The working group planned to meet on March 13, but will need to reschedule to avoid the GICC meeting.

b. EPA Parcels Project [Jeff]

Since last month, the project has made good progress. All 25 of the participating counties have transformed parcel data. Boundary data for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians has been transformed as well. The project team is now reaching out to county parcel data managers to review the results and orient them to the tools; the first webinar is scheduled for March 6. Testing continues on WFS and EN REST Services generated from the county data. Next steps include data flow testing with NC OneMap for ingesting WFS and generating data and services for non-EPA-Network users. NCID integration for user authentication is in process, and the team is making progress on documentation. The project team held a briefing for the Working Group for Seamless Parcels on February 6 and gave an update to the State Government GIS User Executive Committee on February 11. The grant project ends on April 30.

The project team plans to continue to use the GIS coordination structure to find ways to sustain the project beyond 25 counties. This will include the Local Government Committee where consideration of counties by Lead Regional Organization areas is expected to get attention. Also, consultations with David Baker, NC Department of Revenue, will inform selection of the next set of county parcels to transform. The project needs a specific plan for sustaining the tools and data flow. In the meantime, the project team is preparing for submittal for Gate 3 approval.

Based on conversations with members of the project team, Stan emphasized the need to go beyond a 25-county project. Other grant funding may be available (to be determined). In his view, the hard work has been done on the tools and now we need to obtain more content from counties. He confirmed with David Baker that all counties have digital parcel data (even if not offered online for free download) and should be able to upload parcel data to the transformation tool. Stan will meet with David who will help identify counties that can readily participate in the next phase. Also, maintaining the data for the original 25 counties to keep products current is essential. The bulk of the project expense was for development of applications and getting them ready for a statewide resource.

Adding data from more counties involves outreach and action by counties or organizations acting on behalf of counties. The technical challenge for county data managers will relate to specifying the data translation models to match county data fields to target master schema fields. Some counties rely on vendors for GIS tasks, meaning that county staff are likely to need more assistance.

In response to a question from Sarah about operation and maintenance, John explained that minimal maintenance will include hosting (now in the cloud and potentially on CGIA servers) and system administration and technical assistance to data providers. The contract includes an option for operation and maintenance that will consume the remainder of grant funds (the specific costs and time span to be determined). Costs will be in two categories: (1) the hosting cost that may increase incrementally as datasets are added to the system, and (2) technical assistance and administrative cost (labor). Part of the second category will be covered by collaborating agencies.

For example, regarding technical assistance to county data providers, John treats NCDOT time spent on parcel data integration for NCDOT business processes as a sunk cost. A central parcel dataset would improve data quality and would enable NCDOT staff to assist with outreach, e.g., teaching county data managers how to use the tools. Also, Tom Morgan is expected to continue outreach to counties as part of his job duties. A statewide resource will take a collaborative effort among state agencies, providing in-kind services. John added that after the first county submission (setting translation model), subsequent data sharing involves only a few steps using an online tool.

Stan pointed out the value of a protocol for regular uploads of parcel data. County data sharing at some regular interval could include parcels, roads, and address points to serve multiple geographic datasets as part of a collaborative effort between state and local organizations.

In response to a question from Kathryn, Stan estimated that only a handful of counties charge a fee for a copy of county parcel data. (However, research since the meeting by the Land Records Management Program in the Department of the Secretary of State indicates that 33 counties charge for copies of parcel data, a surprising trend). Some counties offer free downloadable parcel datasets (research by Land Records Management Program confirmed that, beyond the 25 pilot counties in the parcels project, 41 counties offer free downloadable parcel data). John reiterated the opportunity for state agencies to help make download and transformation happen on a periodic basis. State agencies will not pay counties for copies of datasets.

c. Statewide Orthoimagery Program

Jeff reported on behalf of the project team that weather conditions last week were not suitable for imagery acquisition flights for the 2014 phase in the Northern Piedmont and Mountains. Flights will take place as soon as clear skies and clear ground permit. For the 2013 Eastern Piedmont phase, deliveries are complete and imagery services and downloadable imagery are available through the NC OneMap Geospatial Portal.

4. Preparation for GICC Meeting March 13

Stan had to reschedule the GICC meeting due to inclement weather. This happened to be the first postponement of a GICC meeting in over 20 years. The March 13 date appears to be good for the majority of members.

5. Report from Each of the Standing Committees

Kathryn reported that the Local Government Committee has a new member (Travis Penland with the City of Hendersonville, Engineering, representing CURISA). James Armstrong (formerly representing CURISA) will continue to serve along with Alice Wilson on the SMAC. The committee finalized a 2-page piece on benefits of statewide data, to be submitted to Stan this week.

John reported that the State Government GIS User Committee Executive Committee met the week before last. There was discussion about the Esri Enterprise License Agreement (renewal upcoming but not urgent) in consultation with John Correllus (who was involved in negotiating the first version). It is likely to remain similar to past agreements. ArcGIS Online tools were a topic of discussion, too. The committee discussed project benefits in the context of state IT projects with geographic information elements. The group is preparing for a general meeting rescheduled for March 27.

Colleen Sharpe submitted a letter to Stan this morning stating her intention to resign from the GICC (Governor's appointment representing the NC League of Municipalities) and to resign as chair of the Technical Advisory Committee. She is transitioning to employment with a private company.

Ryan reported that SMAC has made a change in leadership for its Stream Mapping Advisory Committee. Ryan appointed Cam McNutt of the Division of Water Resources to be the new chair. Former chair Matt Duval will continue to serve on the committee. The group will meet in April and will develop a charter to clarify goals, objectives, and priorities, with a focus on stream data development. The charter will be submitted to the GICC for approval, probably in May. Ryan added that the NC League of Municipalities will recommend an appointment for the GICC (Governor's appointment) to replace Colleen Sharpe.

6. Other Items from the Group

Stan brought up the topic of making a business case for state information technology products, revisiting the discussion on October 21. He explained that a business case needs to go beyond time savings. How time savings are applied to other tasks and business processes and how a project benefits consumers are essential parts of business cases. Sarah added that State Budget Director Art Pope spoke to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee for Information Technology two weeks ago about realization of benefits (see presentation:

[http://www.ncleg.net/DocumentSites/committees/JLOCIT/02-06-](http://www.ncleg.net/DocumentSites/committees/JLOCIT/02-06-2014/IT%20Business%20Cases%20and%20Benefits%20Realization%20Final.pdf)

[2014/IT%20Business%20Cases%20and%20Benefits%20Realization%20Final.pdf](http://www.ncleg.net/DocumentSites/committees/JLOCIT/02-06-2014/IT%20Business%20Cases%20and%20Benefits%20Realization%20Final.pdf)). She explained that Mr. Pope is trying to categorize projects by the types of benefits (e.g., saving lives, improving citizen's access). For GIS, there are bigger business implications than the technical piece. Sarah is pleased that the committee is looking at how GIS is a business enabler. Stan emphasized that this will be an agenda item for Management & Operations. John added that the third bullet is particularly challenging: a business owner needs to make the case for a project, not the IT staff. Sarah acknowledged that during the recession, OSBM was focused on whether state agencies could pay for IT projects and project benefits were secondary. Now the focus is on benefits.

John inquired about new LIDAR data planned for acquisition. CGIA has taken responsibility for serving derived products from the current LIDAR data (collected 10 or more years ago). When NC Emergency Management collects new LIDAR data, how does the process of CGIA creating derived products (e.g., digital elevation models, slope, aspect, hillshade, etc.) and web services become systematic to take advantage of updated (and more detailed) LIDAR data? Given the size of the investment and the many applications of LIDAR and elevation products, John recommends committee discussion to determine a solution sooner rather than later. Stan noted that John Dorman

will present to the GICC on March 13. John added that NCDOT has been involved in 3-D visualizations for the Governor. Having a current, complete, consistent source of LIDAR will be invaluable. Elevation is a framework dataset that is instrumental in orthoimagery production and valuable for many applications.

7. Upcoming Topics

Stan noted that coal ash ponds have been of concern lately. He asked the committee to contact Stan about topics for M&O meetings and GICC meetings.

8. Future Meeting Dates:

March 17

April 21

May 19

June 16

July 21

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.