

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

SMAC Web Site - www.ncgicc.org | CGIA Telephone - 919-754-6580 | NC OneMap Web Site - www.nconemap.com

Wednesday, January 16, 2013; 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

NC League of Municipalities

Albert Coates Auditorium, 215 North Dawson St., Raleigh, NC

Conference Call Number: 641-715-3840; Access Code: 1061167#

Web Conference: <https://its.ncgovconnect.com/ncom>

Welcome/Introductions – Ryan Draughn, Chair

Attending: Ryan Draughn, Tom Morgan, John Bridgers, Jeff Essic, John Farley, Sean McGuire, Hope Morgan, Gary Thompson, Dr. Moore, Silvia Terziotti, Tim Johnson, David Giordano, Jeff Brown and on the phone, Stephen Dew, James Armstrong, Matt Duval, Kelly Eubank, Pam Carver, and Gary Merrill.

Approval of October 10, 2012 Minutes -- approved

NC Geographic Information Coordinating Council

Council Update – Tim Johnson reported on the highlights of the November 15, 2012 GICC meeting. Matt Duval gave a fine technical presentation on applications of geospatial data and technology by the Natural Resource Conservation Service. The Council requested one action: based on a report on the results of the NC OneMap survey of private sector users, the Council requested a list of private sector organizations that may be advocates for NC OneMap. Ron York was reappointed by the NC House as a GICC member (3-year term). Kelly Laughton resigned from the Council. Lee Mandell asked members for suggestions for filling her seat, preferably with another private sector person. Tim informed the Council about the NC GIS Conference, too.

State Government Committee – Sean McGuire reported that the SGUC held a general meeting in November. For technical presentations, Anna Stout described a method for stream buffering for agricultural analysis, Chris Tilley described work with imagery captured after Hurricane Sandy, and John Dorman did a demonstration of the emerging IRISK system for hazard analysis and information. The SGUC executive committee is working on data sharing among agencies, regarding parcel data in particular. The next General Meeting is March 21.

Ryan asked if IRISK is available for viewing; he has interest from insurance underwriters at the League of Municipalities. Hope explained that NC is a pilot project for four counties (Macon, New Hanover, Durham, and Edgecombe) going into production in March. FEMA has gone to risk maps (flood and other hazards), so NC is following suit. John Dorman will do a presentation at the NC GIS Conference. Tim suggested that it could be of interest at a future GICC meeting as a technical presentation.

□ *Local Government Committee* – Alice Wilson/James Armstrong

James Armstrong reported for the LGC. He did not attend the last LGC meeting, but is reporting from the Minutes. In terms of membership, Lucy Cardwell of Currituck County is a new member, representing the NC Property Mappers Association (replacing Jerry Simmons). Also, Alex Rickard left local government (Eastern Carolina Council) to join the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization in Raleigh. Julie Stamper has agreed to fill in as Chair of the LGC until the committee elects a new Chair.

At the LGC meeting, there was discussion about the work of the ad-hoc metadata committee. The LGC held a long discussion about the concepts presented by the NC Board of Examiners for Licensed Surveyors (NCBELS) at a December 11, 2012 meeting (attended by Alex Rickard of LGC). Concerns that there are private firms that are crossing into the surveying realm under the local government exemption ruling that was done a few years back by the Department of Justice. The surveying group wanted to propose new criteria to require certifications primarily in the private sector for geospatial data creation, requiring them to have continuing education and survey exams. This proposal applies only to cadastral data, but there was concern that it could be extended to other geospatial data such as using GPS for street sign locations. There was discussion of differences between parcel data and other data.

The LGC suggested an opinion paper to define concerns of local governments and suggested it be sent to Ryan to address it at the SMAC level. There was discussion about education of local governments on the impacts of this proposal and guidance on contracting for geospatial data services. There were concerns that licensing requirements might result in private proposals for survey grade products that go beyond what a local government needs, raising the cost of products. Suggested working with NCLM and ACC to educate member governments.

In response to a question from Ryan, James explained that an opinion paper has not been written. Ryan may reach out to Tom Tribble (CGIA staff for LGC) to get more information.

Gary Thompson responded to the LGC report. Gary is the Chair of NCBELS and suggested that the LGC may not have the facts straight about the proposal. Gary offered to sit down with local governments to explain the proposal. Ryan suggested that Gary meet with Ryan, Julie Stamper, Tom Morgan, Jeff Brown, and Alex Rickard to clarify the proposal and the facts related to it.

Action item: Ryan will arrange a meeting with the participants noted to discuss the NCBELS proposal and implications for local governments.

James ended his LGC report by noting that the committee discussed results of the NC OneMap user survey and had a discussion about NC OneMap in relation to new software, including ArcGIS Online for Organizations, for data distribution.

□ *Federal Interagency Committee* – Silvia Terziotti reported that FIC will meet face-to-face at the GIS Conference in February.

Work Groups

□ *NC Board on Geographic Names* – Dr. Tyrel Moore provided a report to update the group on the two recommendations that NC BGN brought to SMAC in October were approved by US BGN. There is a proposal to rename a reservoir in Wake County under consideration.

o *Objectionable names* – Dr. Moore explained that an issue of objectionable names arose recently. He spoke with Jenny Runyan at US BGN and Wayne Walcott formerly of NC BGN for background. There was action in 2004 to identify and recommend names for specific streams. Tim added that a legislative bill in 2003 asked the Secretary of State and the GICC to remove the objectionable names from databases. The GICC sent letters to each affected county and asked counties to remove objectionable names from their geographic data. Tim noted that there are databases that are still showing stream segments with those objectionable names. Representative Alexander from Mecklenburg County raised the issue when a transportation project in Union County used stream data that contained an objectionable name that should have been replaced years ago. John Farley coordinated the DOT response. John added that out-of-date stream names can be replicated by derived datasets (e.g., trout streams) or in annotation that is stored separately from line data.

Hope Morgan noted that her office takes county stream data as is and does not change names. John Farley explained that the particular stream in Union County appeared in a state map with the older, replaced name.

Dr. Moore added that there are two types of cases. First, there are cases where a name change request went through the process and was changed and approved and updated in GNIS. The corrective action is to make the databases consistent (federal, state and local). This involves making data consistent with approved names. The second type of case is a proactive approach to change a name that may be objectionable. As part of the BGN process, someone submits a request about an objectionable name. A name change must be based on sufficient local objection to warrant a change (confirmed by Jenny). These are on a stream-by-stream basis.

In the first case includes the Union County stream in question (Salem Creek). Tim and John agreed that databases need to be checked and updated. Historic maps predating the change would not be modified. Dr. Moore sees the data corrections to be a good outcome.

In the second case, it is more problematic to find a solution that emerges from a locality. For names that have not been changed, the process takes many months.

GNIS reflects the approved name changes by US BGN. Apparently, the change has not reached all federal datasets, and legacy datasets may be in use. In some cases, some stream segments for a single name may have been changed but not all.

Silvia and Dr. Moore confirmed that a name may have an historical value that sustains the name even if potentially objectionable in other cases.

Dr. Moore also pointed out that there may be discrepancies in naming on maps that serve different purposes (including permitting).

Ryan asked how the changes from BGN could be communicated to state and local data managers. And he asked if SMAC should be more proactive in finding alternative names for geographic features.

John suggested, for the handful of changes on an annual basis, that an agency could do an annual database search combined with a search of GNIS, plus an annual summary of BGN changes in NC could be a good method. Ryan supported putting a process in place to communicate the few annual changes. John communicated his research to Tim already. CGIA should be involved in the process.

Tom suggested publishing a change in the NC Register. Also the 2003 session law may provide guidance on enforceability and communication.

David pointed out that there may be instances in which an agency cannot make a name change in its maps (another agency may be the data custodian or for some other reason). It would be useful to know that and document it.

Approved: SMAC will develop a process and format for communicating approved name changes and verifying updates in state and local datasets. SMAC will take responsibility for communication, consistent with session law and BGN. (Enforceability is still a question).

The intent is to have a draft by the April SMAC meeting, with more discussion on enforcing and verifying data changes.

There is no action needed by SMAC to respond to Representative Alexander beyond the recent response by NCDOT.

After discussion, the group concluded that BGN is not tasked with initiating a name change for any particular name in GNIS.

□ *Roads and Transportation* – Chris Tilley/Alex Rickard

o *Roads grant project* – John Farley reported for the working group. Alex's last update indicated that over 80 counties were entered in the tool. NCDOT must report all roads to the federal government, so this tool is very useful in adding local roads to the state set. Alex intends to continue to serve on the WGRT.

o *Railroads* – Ken Turrentine in the Rail Division is leading an effort to update and verify all of the line work for statewide rail lines. The draft set of line work was very good, but there are some improvements. They are focused on lines and intend to work on attributes later. There is no specific funding to support this effort.

o *NC StreetMap* – David Giordano presented background on the NC StreetMap tool in the context of the WGRT roads tool to follow up on an action item from the last SMAC meeting.

□ □ *What it is/What it does* – NC StreetMap was completed in 2007. It is a password protected web application. It was funded by a grant to NC DOT from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in 2006. CGIA developed the application, with advice and oversight from the WGRT and SMAC. It was designed to be a repository for street centerline data. It was limited to local, state, and federal agencies. There is download capability for authorized users. The data custodian could allow their data to be made available for download from NC OneMap if desired.

Features of NC StreetMap include levels of accounts for administration. There is no map interface. Upload and download functions relate to the digital data and metadata. There are 31 data custodians from local governments who have participated, however, there have been no uploads since June 2011. The most popular downloads include NCDOT's street data. There are 352 user accounts. On average, there have been 4 downloads per week. However, by year, the number of downloads has dropped from a peak of 500 during 2007 to less than 10 in 2012. Similarly, uploads have decreased sharply since the implementation of the tool. With usage dwindling (and account requests still coming in) and content relatively static, NC StreetMap needs attention. It does provide a single point of distribution, but what is its future with the emergence of the WGRT tool?

□ □ *Discussion*

John Farley suggested that the new WGRT tool works well for acquiring data and NC OneMap is a working distribution point for free public access. There are many other places to get street centerline data (including county FTP sites), perhaps explaining the diminishing use of NC StreetMap.

Action item: John Farley will take the issue to WGRT and ask the group for a recommendation to SMAC concerning the future of NC StreetMap and what will replace it. And how to communicate to users.

Jeff asked John about the vision for distribution of county by county street centerline datasets that have been transformed to a standard set of attributes versus the aggregated centerlines that will be managed and distributed by NC DOT in a statewide dataset. How would county datasets be accessible?

John will look into the question. He added that NC DOT will publish map services for roads which may meet the needs of some users.

□ *Seamless Parcels* – Tom Morgan/Pam Carver
o *EPA grant project* –Tom reported that an RFP is in process for a Vendor to develop applications for the project. Jeff provided some background information on the grant project. Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians is a partner on the grant project. CGIA is managing the grant. WGSP has a key role as advisor. The outcomes will include county cadastral data transformed to standard set of attributes, data sharing through the EPA Exchange Network, and data sharing outside of the network. SMAC will continue to have an important oversight role. The project expects to have a contractor on board in March, and to engage 25 counties for a sample of data producers for the applications.

□ *Orthophotography Planning* – Gary Thompson reported that the working group met on January 14. Darrin Smith updated the group on the 2012 project. Data delivery will begin at the end of January into February. Flight for acquisition for 2013 imagery in the Eastern Piedmont region will begin in February. Anna Stout reported that NAIP 2012 imagery is available from USDA and MrSID files are available for sharing from Dan Madding. The NAD 1983 transformation tool is complete and should be released soon. Gary will let us know. Tom reported that the new LIDAR specification will be approved soon. Gary also updated the group on efforts to revise the GPS standard, and he described his recent work on the National Geospatial Advisory Committee. Tom added that the NAIP is in true color and will be available soon in color infrared. On one other note, recent LIDAR collections have included NC Railroad (its corridors) and Durham County.

□ *Standards* – Tom Morgan reported that Gary has a work plan for updating the GPS standard and is looking for people to write sections. There are roles for GPS users and less technical people to contribute to the update. For review of the land cover standard, Tim Muhs from NC Agriculture will chair a working group and is looking for volunteers. The new LIDAR standard has been published in the NC Register. After minor changes based on comments from USGS to integrate the latest federal standards, the LIDAR standard will be approved by the Secretary of State.

□ *Stream Mapping* – Matt Duvall reported the Advisory Committee met once since the last SMAC meeting. There was a facilitated discussion of stakeholder needs for hydrography data. The next meeting will include a presentation from David Arnold of USGS on how stewardship proceeds (scheduled for January 29 at 9:30).

□ *Metadata* –Steve Averett was not available for the meeting. Ryan noted that the group is looking carefully at ISO standards and related tools for editing and exporting metadata. Jeff Essic explained that the committee will meet next week. Jeff explained that the group is trying to figure out a balance between tools that are based on widely used Esri software and its multiple versions in use around the state, and other tools that would meet needs. Ryan will follow up with Steve.

Regular Status Updates

□ *National Geospatial Programs Office* – Gary Merrill explained that the water districts have realigned (from 7 areas to 6 regions). NC is in the Southeast Region with SC, GA, TN, MS, AL, FL, LA, and AK. National Geospatial Programs Office (NGP) is identifying tasks, roles and responsibilities of the Liaisons. NGP is losing Liaisons to attrition and not replacing them. For NC, Gary and Silvia are identified for tasks related to the National Hydrography Database (NHD) and the Water Community of Users. Elevation Community of Users is represented by Gary, too. Silvia is a part-time associate Liaison for NC. Hope Morgan asked what the reduction in Liaisons means for the USGS Elevation Program. Gary explained that the program is continuing. For budget reasons, USGS was not able to provide cost-share funding to support Wake County's acquisition of LIDAR (\$23,000 was proposed). In years past, that would have been funded as a project. Hope asked if the federal agencies are making progress on putting funding together to achieve the goals of the elevation study (3-D Digital Elevation Program). Gary confirmed that there are plans to go forward, but budget problems persist. Hope explained that NC will have elevation requirements over the next few years (and opportunities to support NC's statewide imagery program) and there is a need to know if federal funding will be available to support NC requirements.

Gary Thompson added that he chaired a committee of National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) on elevation; the group produced a paper that is now available on the FGDC/NGAC website: <http://www.fgdc.gov/ngac/meetings/december-2012/NGAC%20Elevation%20Subcommittee%20Report%20-%20December%202012.pdf>

Gary Thompson noted that there is a statute that empowers FEMA to pull money together from federal agencies for elevation data. Gary Merrill commented that FEMA and USGS are the only agencies that will certainly be involved, but those other agencies need to participate. Tim Johnson commented that Dave Maune's presentation to the GICC indicated that there was a commitment from agencies to fund the program starting in the next fiscal year.

Gary Thompson explained that agencies appear to have money, but there are differences in what each agency wants to accomplish with elevation data. He expects that FEMA has some authority and that some positive things will happen.

Action item: Gary Thompson will update the GICC at the February meeting (as part of the WGOP report). He recommended sharing copies of the elevation study with the GICC.

□ *Geospatial and Technology Management* – Hope Morgan reported that the Floodplain Mapping Program has approval to produce digital-only flood insurance rate maps (print on demand). The new FRIS (Flood Risk Information System) supports a database (eventually replacing the current FMIS (Flood Mapping Information System)). This still follows all FEMA requirements for adoption of flood insurance rate maps (and adopting the database now). NC has achieved a seamless dataset (tiles) which enables regional products. This approach is saving time and money for map maintenance. 50 eastern counties are complete for FRIS. For 50 western counties, information is still available on the FMIS site. The new website will be released in February. Users can determine flood information in a location of interest (base flood elevation, cross-sections, flood zones, etc.). GTM has demonstrated to insurance and real estate people. More counties will be added over time.

□ *NC OneMap* – David Giordano reported that the Geospatial Portal will get software upgrades and the team is adding functions for historic imagery and status of services. Also, based on user comments, there will be an added capability to browse datasets alphabetically in the Browse tab. NC OneMap is building server redundancy in the Western Data Center for reliability purposes. More information will be available in a session at the GIS Conference.

□ *Geospatial Archiving* – Kelly Eubank reported that State Archives and CGIA are considering a proposal for the upcoming FGDC CAP Grant annual grant program. The CAP Grant business planning category is well suited for NC needs at this time. The proposal will be related to the orthoimagery file transfer from NCOneMap to State Archives for data retention. In the meantime, State Archives will work with CGIA on data transfers soon. Formal announcement of the grant from FGDC is pending.

□ *Statewide Orthoimagery Program* – Tim Johnson reported on the two current projects in the program.

o *Coastal 2012*

Visual quality review is complete for all 25 counties. Gary Thompson has managed contractors who have completed the horizontal quality review as well. Delivery of orthoimagery products to the PSAPs is scheduled for January 29 and February (12-15) in a series of four regional meetings. We will be implementing imagery services and download in early March. There will be a warranty period, but local PSAP and GIS personnel participated in early visual quality review that has resolved minor issues in the imagery before delivery.

o *Eastern Piedmont 2013*

Four imagery acquisition vendors are in place (through a Qualifications Based Selection Process or QBS) with contracts. Flights will begin in early February. Tim displayed a map to show the study areas that will be assigned to Surdex (Triangle area), Photo Science (includ, Spatial Data Inc. (southeastern), and Atlas Geographic Data (including Fort Bragg). Flight plans are completed. Additional sensors will be validated using the validation range in Surry County. Land cover analysis and sample areas were established by the project team and will be very useful for visual quality consistency. Fort Bragg gave approval for acquisition over the installation; publication of imagery will be restricted to 911 communication centers adjacent to Fort Bragg (jurisdictions with mutual aid agreements). Imagery within the boundaries of the installation will not be published on NC OneMap. Seymour Johnson Air Force Base approved imagery acquisition over its installation and is likely to approve public access, subject to review of the imagery.

Ryan urged the project team clarify the data restrictions to local governments in the case of Fort Bragg imagery. Tim agreed that this will be explained.

Tim explained the 12 land cover targets analyzed in the region for radiometric quality and expressed appreciation for the work of Tom Morgan, Gary Thompson, the NCDOT Photogrammetry Unit, CGIA, and the contractors. This involves three physiographic regions (Coastal, Piedmont and Sandhills) and four land cover types (urban/industrial, suburban/residential, rural/farmland/wooded and swamp/wetlands. Contractors will use the samples as targets.

New Business – no additional items.

Workplan Action Items and In-Meeting Task Review – Ryan will consult with Jeff Brown and David Giordano to identify the items and tasks.

Adjourn --The meeting adjourned at 3:40.

2013 SMAC Dates

April 10

July 17

October 30