



North Carolina
Geographic Information Coordinating Council
• Local Government Committee

MINUTES
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
March 5, 2009

PROCEEDINGS

The quarterly meeting of the Local Government Committee (LGC), a committee of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC), was held on March 5, 2009. This meeting was originally scheduled for February 26 but was postponed because the scheduled date fell so soon after the 2009 NC GIS Conference.

PRESENT

LGC members:

Amy Durden, Elizabeth City, representing Carolina URISA
Chris Koltyk, Moore County, representing NC LGISA
Alex Rickard, Eastern Carolina COG, representing NC ARCED
Julie Stamper, Pasquotank County, representing NC ACC

Others:

Paul Black, LGC GIS Advisory Team, Triangle J COG
Jon Beck, LGC GIS Advisory Team, Land of Sky Regional Council
Jeff Brown, CGIA
Tom Morgan, Land Records Management Program
Tom Tribble, CGIA, Staff to the LGC

ABSENT

Steve Randone, Brunswick County, representing NC PMA
Colleen Sharpe, City of Raleigh, representing NC LOM

GICC REPORT

The complete minutes for the February 11, 2009 meeting of the GICC are available at the GICC web site.

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

The GIS implementation plan passed the joint legislative committee and will go to the House and Senate for consideration for inclusion in the state budget. More than 30 members of the GIS community showed up at the committee meeting on January 27. Julie expressed appreciation to the representatives of local government that attended.

Pictometry gave a presentation on oblique imagery. E911 funds can be spent to acquire orthophotography or oblique imagery within a certain period of time, but not both.

There was a presentation by Ed Southern, Division of Archives, who said that he welcomed the archiving recommendations from the GICC's Archival and Long Term Access *ad hoc* committee. He asked for support from the State Government Users committee and from the LGC in discussing a plan to move forward. The LGC will discuss this later in the agenda.

SMAC REPORT

Prior to the LGC meeting, Jason Mann, LGC rep to the SMAC, submitted a written report on the January 7 SMAC meeting to the LGC members. In Jason's absence Tom summarized a few of the items from Jason's report.

Gary Thompson reported on the ortho cost share program and is looking to know which counties plan to fly in 2009.

The LGC was asked to appoint a member to the NC Board on Geographic Names. The LGC will address this later in the agenda.

Hope Morgan from the Floodplain Mapping Program reported that FMP expects to complete mapping building footprints for all counties by the end of 2009.

Chris Koltyk asked if FMP planned to share the data. It was reported that Brunswick County received their building footprint data from FMP. Chris asked if they were acquiring the footprints from counties or mapping them independently. The answer is both. Chris expressed concern stating that FMP acquires local data but doesn't always share the data they collect. He questioned why the digital floodplain maps are not considered official. Apparently FEMA designates the paper mps as the official maps.

Julie noted that FMP is doing better in the area of sharing data and that Hope is working hard to work with counties. Chris indicated that his concern came from the earlier period

when the original floodplain zones were mapped. He thinks that FMP is moving in the right direction.

NC MASTER ADDRESS DATASET PROJECT

Jeff Brown from CGIA attended in place of Joe Sewash and gave a report to the LGC on the Master Address Dataset project.

Jeff reported that the Office of State Budget & Management is the client and OSBM is interested in maximizing the NC count in the 2010 census. Twenty-four counties did not participate in the Local Updates of Census Addresses (LUCA) program. The current project will hopefully provide complete and up-to-date data for those counties and addresses for new construction in other counties that has occurred since LUCA was completed.

Jeff noted the benefits of having a complete count. Federal funding for states is calculated on a per capita basis. Distribution of the state sales tax to counties is also made on a per capita basis. He indicated that at the conclusion of the project CGIA would provide to counties updated metadata records, work flows and tools that are developed.

An implementation plan that includes requirements, design, and recommendations is being developed.

Outreach will take place in March and April. Local governments will be notified and the GIS Coordinators will be asked to complete a survey to clarify what data sets are available for download or transfer. Address points, street centerlines, building footprints and parcels, if available, are the critical datasets. Work on building the master address dataset will begin in April with a deadline for completion on June 30. The data will be processed to a standard format that includes general address points and standard attributes.

Jeff reported that the project team has already established work flows and created tools to facilitate the processing. The primary goal is to provide an improved master address dataset to the Census Bureau – in the format that they use. The data could be made available in other formats. Other products available to local governments will be updated and more polished metadata, work flows, operating procedures, and extension tools for ArcGIS.

Jeff noted that local help and cooperation will be vital and that the project team hopes to minimize the impact on local governments. In the near future a letter will go out to County Managers seeking their cooperation. Copies will go to the county GIS Coordinator. The survey will be in survey monkey format.

Julie asked if CGIA planned to respond to the issues and concerns that the LGC submitted in writing to Joe Sewash.

Tom reported that Joe had planned to respond to the LGC's letter today. Joe had to miss the meeting due to an illness in the family and will respond after he returns. Jeff noted that he had read the concerns and that the goal was to minimize the impact on local government.

Chris asked how the Census Bureau will benefit from this effort. He expressed concern that the Census Bureau will ultimately receive data sets from 3 different sources (cities, counties and the state) and was concerned about potential confusion, duplication and redundancy.

Jeff answered that the data that CGIA will provide will be in the same format as the files that the Census Bureau gets from local governments and that they will be able to cull out duplicates.

Alex Rickard asked if he could obtain the list of counties that did not participate in LUCA. Jeff said he would share that.

Chris asked if we could not get the information we are looking for from the Ramona survey that many local governments have already completed.

Jeff answered that the project team considered that and reviewed the Ramona responses. Unfortunately while there is some overlap the information from Ramona does not include everything that is needed. Jeff noted that Julie and Colleen Sharpe had taken the survey and had useful suggestions for how to improve it.

Julie indicated that the survey does not take long but that it is somewhat repetitive if you have completed Ramona. She acknowledged that she didn't know how else CGIA could do it.

NC StreetMap

Alex reported that he had little to report on NC StreetMap itself and would focus more on the Working Group for Roads and Transportation. NC StreetMap has not changed much. Janet Lowe, the WGRP co-chair recently sent an email to the list serves encouraging local governments to post their street centerlines to NC StreetMap.

The WGRT met in January. Some members requested Bike and Pedestrian standard and updates to rail corridors. The group decided to table those requests until the WGRT has completed an update to the street centerline content standard. Alex reported that the GICC adopted the Geographic Data Content Standard for Transportation Roads Data in 2005.

Alex noted that you can read the current standard at the GICC web sites (under Standards). He encouraged people to read it and see if they can fit their local centerline data into the standard. The standard itself is only 5 pages long.

The committee that developed the standard was a good group but was overwhelmingly from DOT and state government. The new committee that will address this standard will have 3 state government reps and 13 local government reps. WGRT plans to talk the new schema to the SMAC in July and to the GICC in August. The WGRT feels that it will then be in a better place to apply for an FGDC CAP grant to test and implement the standard.

STATE PARCEL COORDINATOR

Tom Morgan is with the Land Records Management Program and is designated as the State Parcel Coordinator. This item was moved up on the agenda because Tom needed to attend another meeting.

Julie asked tom to explain the role of the State Parcel Coordinator and how it affects local government.

Tom reported that the Federal Geographic Data Committee's Cadastral Subcommittee wants a single contact person in each state who can serve as the primary contact for questions about data availability and other issues. Tom said that he is basically a facilitator. Rex Minniman, Tom's predecessor at the LRMP, served in this role previously.

Tom Tribble asked if he expected this role to expand.

Tom Morgan answered yes saying that once the work of the Working Group for Seamless Parcels implemented a program for uploading parcel data from counties and sharing the data over NC OneMap, he envisioned that his role could change. He also noted that the feds had appoint system that rated how states are doing in terms of parcel data. North Carolina was not rated at the top but is pretty high.

Alex noted that the next WGSP meeting is March 20.

SURVEYOR'S MODEL LAW COMMITTEE

Prior to the meeting, Julie distributed a letter from the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors listing GIS data layers that NCBELS suggests fit into either "inclusion" category – data that must be approved by a surveyor - or "exclusion" category – data that does not require a surveyor's approval.

Alex suggested that NCBELS should only list those layers that require surveyor's approval with the understanding that all other data layers do not. He noted that the next meeting of the committee is Thursday Mar 12, 10:30-12:00 in Raleigh.

Paul Black reported that he had talked to representatives from the academic community about NCBELS. Geography faculty members are just beginning to pay attention and are

concerned that their students may not be employable. Paul suggested that there are for general categories of work or data that require surveying. They are platting new lots; marking forestland to be timbered; any kind of digging or earth moving; erecting any kind of new structure; and any kind of ground control.

Paul was invited to represent the LGC on the committee and he said he would be happy to. Neither Julie nor Tom was certain about the protocol for being appointed to the committee. Tom will check with Tim Johnson, who staffs that committee.

Julie asked about the panel session at the NC GIS Conference. Alex replied that it evolved into more of an open debate about certification vs. licensure. At Butler, President of the GIS Certification Institute Board of Directors, made a strong case for certification and made the point that there is not licensure for a software engineer or a computer programmer. Mr. Butler contends that it would be very difficult to design a licensure program for members of the GIS community, which apply to the technology to a wide range of disciplines.

Alex noted that this issue is not seen as important to the local government GIS community because local government is exempt to many of the rules. However, he noted that the exemptions do not apply if a jurisdiction partners with an adjacent county or city to collect geospatial data.

Paul asked about allies that could join the debate and mentioned the academic community and small GIS consulting firms that did data development for local governments.

ARCHIVES AND LONG TERM PRESERVATION

Julie reminded the group about the presentation at the GICC by Ed Southern, Division of Archives, who said that he welcomed the archiving recommendations from the Council's Archival and Long Term Access *ad hoc* committee. He asked for support from the State Government Users committee and from the LGC in discussing a plan to move forward. At the GICC meeting, Julie promised that the LGC would participate in the review.

Tom reported that he spoke to Zsolt Nagy, CGIA Coordination Program Manager, before the LGC meeting. Zsolt indicated that the Division of Archives planned to schedule a web-cast to explore how to proceed. LGC members will be invited to attend so they can better understand the potential impact on local governments. Tom suggested that we also invite John Gallimore and Kat Clifton, who represented the LGC on the Archives and Long Term Preservation *ad hoc* Committee to participate in the web cast. After that presentation, the LGC can determine the continuing commitments or requirements and decide whether it wants to ask John and Kat to resume their participation of find new local government representatives.

ROLE OF GIS ADVISORY TEAM

At its December meeting, the LGC decided to invite A Team members to join the next LGC meeting and to discuss the role of the A Team, the value of their attendance at LGC meetings and the practicality of inviting 12 new people to participate in the conference call.

Paul and Jon Beck were asked for their opinions. Paul thought it was a good idea for A Team members to attend because the in depth discussions would give them an insight into a particular issue. Jon was unsure that the discussion would be that helpful.

Julie suggested that we try to schedule a face-to-face meeting with A Team members at a future LGC meeting. The May was suggested as a possible date. Tom suggested that since the LGC members would be up for reappointment in June and that there might be some turnover, then it might be best to wait until the Aug meeting to make these arrangements. It was agreed that the LGC would invite A Team members to join the A Team in a face-to-face meeting, either during the Aug LGC meeting or the Aug GICC meeting.

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The LGC continues to discuss ways in which it can identify issues of concern to local governments.

Chris noted that Billy Willis chairs the E911 Board. E911 is a major user of geospatial data and seeks support from local GIS staff. Yet no GIS representative sits on the E911 Board. Many local government GIS staff are still unaware of what E911 money can pay for. Should the GIS unit charge E911 for data? Or for maintenance, of the master address street guide for example.

Julie suggested that the LGC send a letter to Billy Willis asking that someone representing local government GIS be added to the E911 Board.

On another topic, Chris emphasized the importance of state government participation in the ortho cost share program. Right now money comes from federal government or local government. Chris noted that Lee Mandell has emphasized the role of state agencies in managing statewide geospatial data layers but statewide data sets are mostly a compilation of local data sets that most of the data comes from local governments. We need to emphasize the importance of the state contributing to these costs? Chris emphasized that local governments are looking outside the property tax base for funding for GIS operations.

Tom noted that the GIS Study recognized the need for state support and cost share funds and that Chris' question makes the case for supporting the recommendations in the GIS Study implementation plan.

Julie asked how we can lobby legislators. Tom suggested that the LGC raise that question with Lee Mandell and Rebecca Troutman, two GICC members who have long

experience working with the legislature. Chris acknowledged that the local government GIS community needs to work on improving communication with elected officials. Chris also suggested that we include Ryan Draughn, GICC representative from the NC League of Municipalities, when we solicit advice on how best to communicate with elected officials.

Alex expressed some confusion about exactly what Chris meant. Are we asking how we fund the collection of local geospatial data? Or are we asking how we fund data sharing efforts?

Chris responded that the issue is not data sharing. He feels that the solution to data sharing is the adoption and application of consistent standards and establishing a place to store the data both for backup and for 24/7 data access by state and federal agencies. Chris thinks the funding source for developing data is uncertain and not guaranteed and varies from local government to local government.

Julie asked if everyone is willing to share data with other government agencies. Everyone said yes. Chris indicated that there are potential funding sources for *the development and maintenance of specific* data sets. Local utility providers (water, waste water, gas, electric) pay for their operation from service fees they collect from their users and so maintenance of GIS layers that represent that infrastructure should come from service fees rather than rely on property tax to pay for it all. A similar situation exists with the E911 fund; a fee is being collected by the phone company to help receive 911 calls. Master Street Address Guide data is used for that function and maintenance of MSAG is an eligible E911 expense.

APPOINTMENT OF LGC REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

Julie asked that Tom acquire a description of the activities of the Board for Geographic Names and the role of the LGC representative. Once that information is in hand the LGC will seek a volunteer.

LGC STRUCTURE

Tom noted that the LGC agreed on most of the items in the last meeting.

- The LGC will make an effort to meet face-to-face for the first meeting after annual appointments are made.
- Two year staggered terms do not violate the bylaws. Tom will encourage LGC member organizations to adopt this approach to appointments when annual appointments are made in June.
- A Team members will be invited to join the quarterly LGC meetings. The LGC members will assess how well this works practically.
- The meeting dates have already been changed to two weeks after the GICC meetings.

It is expected that the GICC will examine the bylaws for all of its committees in the next year and this may resolve other issues.

Julie urged that LGC members designate a backup in the event that they cannot attend. It was suggested that the backup could be one of the A Team members, appointed by the LGC representative.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

NEXT MEETING

The next LGC meeting is scheduled for Thursday May 28.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.