

Nebraska GIS Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes -- October 10, 1998

Present were (authorized to vote "+"):

Mahendra Bansal	+	Natural Resources Commission
John Beran	.	State Surveyor's Office
Jim Brown	+	State Surveyor
Dennis Burling	+	Department of Environmental Quality
John Erickson	.	Department of Health and Human Services
Val Goodman	+	Legislative Computer Services
Erik Hubl	.	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Ed Kelley	.	Nebraska Department of Roads
Mele Koneya	+	Game and Parks Commission
Tom Lamberson	+	Department of Environmental Quality
Cathy Lang	+	Property Tax Division
Jim Langtry	+	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
Steve Larsen	+	OPPD
Bob Martin	+	Property Tax Division
Jim Merchant	+	Conservation and Survey Division - UNL
John Miyoshi	+	Lower Platte North NRD
Jerry Odum	.	National Geodetic Survey/NOAA
Troy Pomajzl	.	Milestone Solutions, Inc.
Scott Richert	.	Lancaster County Assessor's Office
Steve Schafer	.	DAS-Intergovernmental Data Services Division
Doug Steinke	.	Central Platte NRD
Duane Stott	+	Scottsbluff County Surveyor
Stu Sutherland	.	Professional Surveyor's Association of NE
Cliff Welsh	+	NACO - Keith County Commission
Paul Yamamoto	.	Department of Environmental Quality
Larry K. Zink	.	Coordinator, GIS Steering Committee

Complete Meeting Agenda

MAJOR MEETING TOPICS

<u>Multipurpose Land Information Systems Stds.</u>	<u>Steering Committee Budget Proposal</u>	<u>Geodetic Control - Priority Database</u>
<u>Governmental Units - Priority Database</u>	<u>Transportation - Priority Database</u>	<u>Digital Orthoimagery - Priority Database</u>
<u>Elevation Data - Priority Database</u>	<u>Hydrology - Priority Database</u>	<u>Soils - Priority Database</u>
<u>Cadastral - Priority Database</u>	<u>Land Cover/Land Use - Priority Database</u>	<u>Property Parcels - Priority Database</u>
<u>Recommendations on GIS-related Tech. Plans</u>	<u>Education Subcommittee</u>	<u>FGDC Metadata</u>
<u>Annual Report</u>	<u>Federal Agency Representative</u>	<u>Next Meeting Date</u>

NOTICE OF MEETING: A public notice of the meeting, pursuant to Section 84-1411 R.R. S. 1943, was published in the Lincoln Journal-Star on Sept. 24, 1998.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Jim Brown called the meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. and requested a call of the roll. Nine duly authorized representatives were present at the time of the roll call. Therefore, a quorum was present to conduct business. Cathy Lang introduced Bob Martin as her representative for this meeting following 1:30 PM.

MINUTES: Chairperson Jim Brown requested approval for the July minutes. Jim Merchant moved for the minutes of

the July 23, 1998 Steering Committee meeting to be approved as distributed. Jim Langtry seconded the motion. The motion passed (*see vote #1*).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS FOR MULTI-PURPOSE LAND INFORMATION

SYSTEMS: Erik Hubl reported that due to the approval of funding for travel expenses for this committee, they were able to meet on September 23 in Hastings, Nebraska. In the morning, they visited the Adams County Assessors office. Assessor Dale Gardner explained their operation. They manage about 16,640 parcels on a mainframe. They have paper cadastral maps in eight separate map books. These books are considerably outdated. Dale recently signed a contract with Milestone to update these books and to provide Arc View access to this digital database. Milestone does not have plans to utilize the control used with the GMM pilot project in updating those cadastral maps. They also spent a considerable amount of time discussing their parcel ID structure and how they look up property on their system. Adams County has completed a road reference system for their E911 system.

They continued to the Registrar of Deeds office and then to the County Roads Department. There, interim Director Greg Foster explained the GMM pilot process. The coordinates obtained from the digitizing of the quad sheets match quite well with acceptable results. The GPS work and the quad sheets appear to be a good process.

As Jim Brown pointed out in an earlier report, Adams County has GPSed nearly nine points per township as opposed to two as called for in the original pilot plan. This helps with the geo positioning of the control grid on the maps they are creating. Further validation of the good quality work was evident, in another meeting, when Jim pulled up the USGS DOQQ's behind the control grid and it is possible to see how well they correlate.

The Advisory Committee then met at the City Engineer's office to discuss the next section, cadastral data. A considerable amount of work still needs to be done by the Advisory Committee before it can be released for review. The Advisory Committee feels there has been sufficient time for people to review the first three draft sections and would like to propose to the Steering Committee that they adopt sections 5,6 and 7 as the Nebraska Guidebook for local government to multipurpose land information systems.

Jim Brown added that the Adams County contract with Milestone was something of a surprise to him. He has since been in contact with Milestone to compare notes with them on what their project really entails and get the data that was done by Adams County involved in the project. Erik stated that he is hopeful that they are early enough into this project that the data can be blended right in. Troy Pomajzl commented that they are just getting started and there is plenty of time to meet and decide what to do. Jim Brown said that this was basically a communicate failure between the various parties that is being corrected.

Larry explained that the experience in Adams County is an excellent indicator as to why this guidebook is important. Adams County is one of the several counties that are looking at investing some significant money in this area. Standards will prove very useful to them.

John Miyoshi moved that the Steering Committee adopt sections V, VI and VII as proposed for the working outline of the Nebraska Guidebook as recommended by Erik Hubl. Jim Merchant seconded it.

Mahendra Bansal pointed out that there were some suggestions made by the NRC some time ago that have not been addressed. He specifically objected to the use of the word 'cylindrical' in the description of Figure 4 on page VI -3, maintaining that cylindrical is not referenced in the planar coordinate system section. Mahendra indicated that as a standards document, this type of thing needs to be consistent. Larry Zink noted that the committee had spent considerable time and had some good discussions addressing NRC's concerns. Larry reported that since the last Steering Committee meeting he had received differing feedback from NRC staff regarding the current draft. Because of this differing feedback, he had check with Dayle to ascertain who was representing the agency in this matter and was informed that Brian Dunnigan was the official NRC representative. Brian had indicated that he felt the changes Mahendra was suggesting were not necessary.

Erik commented that at the Hastings meeting, Brian reported that he had looked through the comments Mahendra was referring to but decided to accept the sections as they were written. Mahendra clarified his understanding of the purpose of a review is to make the document better. This is an issue of improving the document, not of selecting one

agency's opinion. Mahendra stated his belief that there was something missing from this part of the document. Planar and cylindrical are the same because engineering people use cylindrical and others use planar or co-planar. Erik asked if Mahendra was suggesting a better description of how cylindrical was derived. Mahendra maintained that whatever is done it needs to be consistent. Either change everything to cylindrical or change it to planar.

Erik explained that he did not want to change it to cylindrical because that would mean having to get into conical projections. Under a planar coordinate system, they can consist of either a cylindrical type model or a conical type model. Mahendra said that these are two different names for the same things. Either the document needs to specify that planar is cylindrical and conical as well. To resolve the matter, Erik agreed to replace the word cylindrical with planar under figure 4, page VI-3 and the title of the graphic figure.

Erik suggested that for people who like the details of this, it is useful to know cylindrical and planar. However, it is important to keep in mind the perspective of local government officials and not overwhelm them with complex stuff like this. Cathy Lang commented that these groups will give these standards to any group they might contract or work with and accuracy is critical.

Erik said that when Brian discussed this, he did not see a problem, but Mahendra is right that there is not a good explanation of the words in here. A simple fix of this problem would be to change the word to planar. The other option is to take it back to the Committee to add additional paragraphs of explanation. Jim Brown commented that this is the first draft of a flexible document and it will need additional review later.

Mahendra explained that the second problem he found was on page VII – 3 paragraph two. He suggested that the phrase 'two types of positional accuracy' be changed to 'two systems of positional accuracy'. Larry stated his disagreement with Mahendra's specific suggestion, and indicating his concern that the Steering Committee is not the appropriate body to address these types of editorial changes. Mahendra maintained that the changes he was suggesting were important to the technical accuracy of the document. Erik noted that the Advisory Committee did discuss the comments quite thoroughly. Mahendra said that as a technical document, it should be consistent.

Erik stated that the Advisory Committee is not trying to create a perfect document. They are trying to create a working tool that will need adaptation and growth in time. He said that he would like to stay with the version submitted.

Dennis Burling proposed either the request be sent back to the Advisory Committee for discussion or the document be accepted as it. It is a working document and is meant to be changed. Jim Brown called for a vote on accepting the document as it is with the change on page VI-3. He would like to get something out to the public as soon as possible.

Cathy Lang suggested that the Steering Committee might benefit from sending this document back for another redraft. The wording and accuracy needs to be carefully considered every step of the way, rather than waiting until the entire document has been drafted and going back to revise it then.

Jim Brown commented that this is somewhat different because it is not a rule or regulation, it is an informational document. There are more sections to come in and when everything goes out, it will still be a draft. Stu Sutherland added that this is going out as a draft to the people who are interested or need to be informed on it. A draft invites comments back from the people who receive it. The Committee is going to have to return to address any changes that arise some time in the future. Jim clarified his vision of this process as being a section by section approval process. Eventually, all the sections will come together as a complete document and there will be more work done to fit the sections together along with an additional approval stage.

Jim Brown felt that it was critical to get this information out to the public as soon as possible. While he is interested in ensuring its technical accuracy, he does not feel it is so critical the document needs to be held back because of it.

Jim Merchant asked about recommendation on page VI-10. The recommendation is for all non-federal lands in Nebraska. While the State has no direct control over federal lands, why restrict the recommendation to non-federal lands. It might be wise to recommend all lands in Nebraska be treated the same way. Whether or not the federal agencies abide by that is another issue. Erik explained that it was because of the jurisdiction issue. His own experience with the USGS is that they try to follow along with any local and state rules and regulations. They did not want to

actually put it down in writing as a mandate. Larry commented that the language in question was likely lifted from another document. Jim Merchant said he sees no reason to restrict this to non-federal lands. The Steering Committee has a stake in seeing that the entire state be treated in the same fashion, and that includes federal lands. Jim Merchant suggested that the Advisory Committee take this into consideration.

Jim Brown commented that he is sure that language was lifted directly from other states. The reason it is present in other state's documents is that in places like Texas, Alaska, Florida, Texas and California, they have very unique systems. In Alaska, not all the land is subdivided. In Florida, they have some swampland that is not subdivided. In California, they have the kingdom and the Spanish system, which are not subdivided. In Texas, they use the Spanish system. Some of these are on federal lands. That language is not needed in Nebraska. On the other hand, it is not detrimental in Nebraska. There are no lands in Nebraska that are not subdivided into rectangular plots.

Larry asked how the Steering Committee would like to label these documents. Currently, they have been going out as drafts and the Advisory Committee would like to change that to version date.

Cliff Welsh proposed that if the Steering Committee felt changes needed to be made they should simply make the changes instead of sending it back to the Advisory Committee for revision. Larry stated his concern about the process of the Steering Committee making significant changes in the document, on the basis of one person's concern, without also taking the time to give due consideration to how a given change might affect the rest of the document. Cliff said that it should go out as a draft.

John Miyoshi moved that the MPLIS Guidebook be adopted as a dated version. Jim Merchant seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #2*).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE EXPENSES: Larry noted the Steering Committee motion at its last meeting to reimburse the members of the Advisory Committee on Standards for Multipurpose Land Information Systems for their committee related expenses. Larry explained that in the meantime, he and Steve Schafer had looked at the GIS Steering Committee statutes, and the authority for this is not real clear. The Steering Committee is authorized to reimburse its members expenses. It also has the authority to create advisory committees, but these are in two separate sections. In contrast, in the NIDCAC statutes, they are together and the authority to reimburse advisory committee member's expenses is explicitly stated. There are two apparent ways to resolve this issue. The first is to attempt to get specific authorization from the Governor. The second is to invite NIDCAC to co-sponsor this advisory committee.

Steve Schafer emphasized that if NIDCAC co-sponsor's this advisory committee, it will be in a passive role. They do not wish to exercise any review or approval of the document. He cannot speak for the full NIDCAC group, but he does not envision any problems with this request.

John Miyoshi moved to adopt the proposed resolution to invite NIDCAC to co-sponsor the resolution. Jim Langtry seconded. The motion passed (*see vote # 3*).

RESPONSE TO GIS STEERING COMMITTEE BUDGET PROPOSAL: Larry Zink reported that at the last meeting the Steering Committee voted to propose some budget increases. The proposed changes include increasing the basic operational budget of the Steering Committee to \$10,000 from \$3,000, asking for \$40,000 for outreach, educational and coordination efforts, and for an additional staff person to work with Larry on these efforts. Those budget requests were forwarded to Steve Schafer who consulted with the head of DAS. The current DAS budget proposal includes support for the \$10,000 operational budget and the \$40,000 for outreach, educational and coordination programs, but it does not include the funds for an additional staff person. Larry noted that DAS did include language referring to the request for an additional staff person in the budget proposal narrative and this will allow the Steering Committee to go before the Appropriations Committee to make a case if it wishes to do so.

Steve Schafer explained that the DAS director has to argue for and support anything in her budget and the GIS budget falls within the DAS budget. One issue with the additional position is that, along with the other agencies, DAS is being encouraged to hold down growth. There are several operational positions that are essential to other parts of the agency that need to be included. She wanted to be able to make the statement that the only positions being requested were critical operational positions. It was felt that including the GIS position would make that an inaccurate

statement. In addition, she was hesitant to expand one activity until the impact of the new office of the Chief Information Officer was better understood. However, that does not prevent the GIS Steering Committee from taking this before the Appropriations Committee as an independent entity.

Larry commented that he felt the most pressing issue is to determine how to address this issue in the Annual Report. There are two Steering Committee meetings before the Appropriations Committee meets, but the Annual Report needs to be approved at the next meeting. Tom Lamberson suggested telling the story as it occurred. The Steering Committee made a recommendation that did not go forward because of reasons from the DAS. Jim Brown added that this Committee already voted to ask for it and he does not see any harm in continuing to ask for it in the Annual Report. The Committee has until March to decide whether they feel strongly enough to go before the Budget Committee. Tom said that the Committee voted to ask for it and it did not get included. That piece needs to be put in the Annual Report.

Larry pointed out that the \$40,000 for educational uses did get included. When the Education Committee proposed this amount, it did not spend much time getting specific about the uses of the funds because it didn't seem a good investment of time until the funding was more likely to occur. Now that it has been included in the DAS budget proposal, the Education Committee or someone, needs to define more specifically how those funds would be utilized. Jim Merchant observed that in requesting \$40,000, the assumption was made that there would be someone there to do the work. Larry agreed, adding that in any case, more concrete plans need to be drafted. Tom Lamberson commented that there are a lot of things that can happen between now and March.

Larry asked if the Committee had any objections to the Education Committee working on further defining how the \$40,000 would be used. Jim Brown said that absolutely that was the best action, and preferably before the November meeting.

FOLLOW-UP ON PRIORITY DATABASES:

Geodetic Control: Jim Brown reported that they have taken very little action on this database. He had met with Erik Hubl, Jerry Odum, Larry Zink and Jim Langtry. They convinced Jim to try to move forward to height modernization control for Nebraska so that they can use the vertical component of GIS. So they started a dialogue with the NGS to see what they can do to move the federal government forward faster in height modernization. That will require some gravimetric studies, some conventional leveling and some very high order GPS work to try to modernize the geoid. If that can be done, then they are able to use the 'z' component of global positioning for more accurate level work. Jim Brown has long believed this was something that needed to be done, but has been waiting for the federal government to do it. In two months, he is hoping to come back with some more progress. If this goes forth, it is will need to become a joint project between a several agencies and the federal government. There are numerous areas where having the vertical component available would be very helpful. The next step is to figure out what it will take to get this moved up on the federal agenda. Also, the State Surveyor's Office is looking into posting a map of the HARN stations on the Internet with references to the NGS site for the first, second and third order stations below that.

Government Units: Larry said that he and Val had met a couple of times and the list in the agenda package is a refinement of the issues in this area. The categories fall into three tiers. The first tier is areas where something is happening already and needs only to be documented. There are more questions about how to implement the policies involved in the second tier. The third tier is comprised of areas that do not appear to be important on a state level. They are still in the process of refining this. The next step is to try to do some basic research on all these issues that have been identified before a broader committee is convened.

Larry noted that at the last meeting, the Steering Committee approved in principal a study committee on both the Governmental Units databases and the Transportation databases. Larry indicated that he felt it would be helpful to these Advisory Committees, if the Steering Committee defined more clearly the charge that it was giving these committees. For this purpose, Larry had developed draft resolutions, for the Steering Committee's consideration, which defines what the Steering Committee is expecting these committees to accomplish. The first draft resolution was for the Governmental Units Advisory Committee, and the second for Transportation, both of which were previously approved by the Committee. The draft basically creates the committee, defines the lead agency, and identifies those agencies or groups who should be included on the committee or be consulted and refers back to the

Steering Committee's long-range goals and objectives for the specifics of the Advisory Committee's charge. Larry suggested the Steering Committee adopt these resolutions.

Jim Merchant moved to adopt the resolution creating an Advisory Committee on Governmental Units Database. Mele pointed out that under section 4, the word 'hydrologic' appears in error. Larry suggested that it must be a "cut-n-paste" error and that the word 'hydrologic' should be removed. Cliff Welsh seconded the motion.

Tom Lamberson asked why Larry included a termination date of one year. Larry explained that it was just so the Advisory Committee didn't have an ongoing life, but that the Steering Committee could extend its mandate if it was warranted.

The motion passed (*see vote # 4*).

Transportation: Larry said that he, Ed Kelley and Dick Genrich have met once but they have no written update. There is a resolution to create a transportation advisory committee also. The word 'hydrologic' from section 4 needs to be removed here also. This resolution defines what the transportation committee would be doing to help the Department of Roads internally as well as to let the legislature know what is going on. Larry added that the Steering Committee voted to form this committee last time but did not outline any expectations.

Jim Brown asked for a motion to approve this resolution. Jim Merchant noted that no voting member from Roads was present at that meeting and asked if this was an issue best deferred until there was some representation from Roads here. Jim Brown asked if Dick had been involved in the drafting of the resolution. Larry indicated that Dick had not seen the draft language of the resolution because he had been out-of-town. The Committee decided to defer action on this resolution until a representative from the Department of Roads could be present to comment.

Digital Orthoimagery and Elevation Data: Mahendra began by explaining what the NRC is currently doing. The DOQ's have been developed from 1993 NAPP photography. They are 1-meter resolution. The DOQ's are created using DEM's. The DEM's at this time are level 2, 30-meter intervals. What they are proposing for the next generation is to revise the DOQ's with 1999 NAPP photography and use DEM's that are 10-meter intervals. The NRC will make the change to color infrared only if another agency will pay for color NAPP photography. DOQ's are used as base maps in revising other coverages like DRG's by USGS. The NRC feels that being as the DOQ's are based on information 5-6 years old, they need to be revised and this proposal is outlined in the NRC's technology plan.

There are two sides to this area, the DOQ's and the DEM's. The NRC and USGS are copartners in this work. For this reason, the NRC contacted USGS to ask if they were interested in participating in these efforts. USGS is only half enthused. They said that if the NRC wants to revise the DRG's, then they would definitely participate in the project. If the NRC does not want to revise the DRG's, they need more agencies participating to share the cost of color flights. The NRC's technology plan includes cost and personnel estimates for both contingencies.

DRG's, Digital Raster Graphics, are the topographic maps generated by the USGS and they are quite old, ranging from the 50's-60's. This is the most requested map the USGS has. They plan to update the DRG's anyway. Updating the DRG's requires DOQ input. There are two ways to update a DRG, the raster method and the other is vector method. The USGS currently uses the vector method. In using Intergraph GIS system, they are finding raster method will be easier. DRG's are the combination of color plates. Each map has some ten to twenty five coverages. Most of these are easily revised using the raster method, but the contours have to be done vector. They believe revising the DRG's is a much larger project than revising the DOQ's.

The NRC's priorities rank revising the DRG's as much lower than the DOQ's. DOQ's are important as base maps for a lot of other activities so the NRC is concentrating on revising the DOQ's and DEM's. They are not sure if the USGS will participate in this project. If the USGS does not participate, then the NRC will complete the revisions in gray scale rather than color.

Erik Hubl asked if there was a big advantage to having updated topoquad sheets or DRG's. Mahendra replied that for the USGS it is because that is their best selling product. Jim Merchant clarified that the point of confusion was really that what they use the photo for is not to update the topography but to update the settlement or wooded areas.

Larry commented that his impression of the USGS's position is that they are trying to respond to the demand to get updated topo maps. There are not a lot of topo maps bought in Nebraska so Nebraska is unlikely to be a priority to get the DOQ's, DEM's or DRG's updated. Larry pointed out the issue really is whether revising the DRG's is a priority for the Steering Committee, if it is not a top priority for the USGS.

Jim Merchant said that he feels an Advisory Committee is called for and moved to form one, based on the resolution drafted by Larry. Mahendra explained that Dayle Williamson has already formed a database committee to look into that matter. Jim Brown pointed out that Jim Merchant's motion encompasses at least the individuals listed in Larry's resolution so the Advisory Committee and Dayle's committee can be combined at a later point. Jim Brown stated that he would like to see one committee do the work.

Jim Merchant said that he is not aware that his agency is participating in the NRC committee. Mahendra explained that the committee is still forming and Jim's agency will be a part of it. Jim Merchant clarified his belief that it would be appropriate to combine the committee with guidance from the GIS Steering Committee. Jim Brown added that the backing of the Steering Committee could provide this committee with some additional strength that it will not have if it is formed as an ad hoc committee.

Cliff seconded the motion. The motion passed (see vote #5).

Hydrology: Mahendra reported that in this database is the watershed information from the unit hydrograph. These are all the coverages from all the watersheds in the state of Nebraska. They were developed from 1/24,000 topographic paper maps and are not completely accurate. What is being proposed is inclusion of linear features of these streams. This information is available from the EPA at 1/100,000 scale. To convert this information to 24,000 will require a great deal of work. There are a lot of attributes about these streams that have to be added.

At the national level, this is called National Hydrographic Database. After the next biennium budget cycle is complete and the NRC has the resources necessary, they will proceed to develop this database.

Jim Merchant asked if there are other aspects of hydrology that need to be considered. For example, there is nothing listed about the need to do something with groundwater data. The EPA has a lot of hydrologic information for Nebraska and perhaps the Steering Committee needs to be looking at integrating existing data with the data that is collected. There are other dimensions to hydrology other than just the watershed. A committee needs to be formed to look into these issues. It may also be that the water well database situations comes under this heading.

Larry said that the Department of Water Resources is proposing a new, major GIS development within their agency and might be able to take some leadership.

Jim Merchant moved to form an Advisory Committee to take a look at the issue of water resources. Water resources is a more encompassing subject than hydrography and that is an important distinction. Jim Merchant asked if the NRC would be the lead agency on this. Jim Brown said that had not been determined yet, particularly with the Department of Water Resources moving heavily into GIS. He had hoped they would attend this meeting. Jim Merchant acknowledged that the specific agency taking the lead is not critical, but he does believe that whoever does take the lead needs to consider the larger picture.

Cliff Welsh commented that with respect to database in general and especially in regard to the Department of Water Resources involvement is pending litigation and how available information is handled. There may be some discreet information that for some reason they do not want available to the general public. Jim Brown added that this was a reason why they wanted to include the Department of Water Resources. Cliff said that as a regulatory agency, they have more concern about how much information is accessible. The NRC has had some trouble even getting some information from Department of Water Resources because they are very concerned about how and where that information is used.

Larry said that the question is who is going to be the lead agency to facilitate an interagency dialogue. Jim Brown

suggested leaving the lead agency blank and let the committee come back with a decision as to who the lead agency is. Mahendra said that the NRC is the lead agency for the hydrology database. Larry explained that the NRC was the lead agency to do the initial assessment, but at the time, it was fairly clearly stated that this did not imply that the agencies doing the initial assessment would have the responsibility to be the lead agency for that database permanently. Jim Brown added that for now the NRC could help get this committee formed and get the Department of Water Resources and others to the table to talk.

Jim Merchant suggested a motion to table this issue until the Department of Water Resources can come to the table. Jim Brown said he did not want to do that. Brown said that there are some players at the table who have a stake in a water resources database and the idea is for them to come back and tell the Steering Committee who their lead agency should be. Jim Merchant asked for clarification as to whether the Steering Committee is asking Mahendra to take the initiative to form this committee. Jim Brown proposed that Larry and Mahendra should work together to get an initial meeting of all the parties listed on the draft resolution, and that group should select its lead agency and inform the Steering Committee. Mahendra noted that the NRC had already formed a committee.

Mahendra asked if the lead agency should be a member of the Steering Committee. Jim Brown said groups should meet and come back and tell the Steering Committee who the lead agency is and what the qualifications are. In an effort to move the meeting along, Jim Brown asked for a vote on this motion to adopt the draft Hydrology resolution, with the lead agency line left blank for now. Larry Zink inquired if there was a second and Cliff Welch indicated that he had seconded the motion. Before calling the roll, Larry stated his understanding of what the Steering Committee was voting on, was the adoption of the draft Hydrology Advisory Committee resolution, with the lead agency left blank, and with the understanding that both Larry and Mahendra were to work together to convene an initial meeting of those agencies listed in the resolution and ask them to select a lead agency and inform the Steering Committee. Based on this understanding, the vote roll was called. The motion passed (*see vote #6*).

Larry proposed that the initial assessment reports be included in the Annual Report because they are a major project for the Steering Committee. With respect to that, he expressed some concern that the initial assessment Mahendra wrote regarding a hydrology database indicated there was no further need for additional work. Larry expressed his concern that the assessment says nothing needs doing and now the Steering Committee then is taking action by forming an Advisory Committee. Since additional discussion has changed that assessment, Larry wondered if this assessment could be changed before it is included in the Annual Report. Jim Merchant agreed it should be changed. Mahendra agreed that the situation has changed. No one raised an objection to including a revised Initial Assessment on the Hydrology database in the Annual Report.

Soils: Mahendra reported that about twenty counties have been completed. Fourteen additional counties have been proposed for completion in 1999-2000. That is being prioritized by the NRCS. They anticipate the three agencies, Conservation and Survey, the NRC and NRCS, working together will be able to complete 10-14 counties a year at the current rate. With the addition of an extra person from each agency, that number increases to 17 counties per year. That estimate is flexible because each county is very different with respect to the soil survey.

The current plan is to complete the survey of the entire state by the year 2003. Mahendra did not know how it would be possible to complete by that time. It may take two to four years longer to finish.

Cliff Welsh asked if the Steering Committee sees a need to accelerate this process. Jim Brown said that this issue was addressed in the budget proposal section.

Larry said that Mahendra had indicated the last time they spoke about this issue that the three agencies involved would be coming up with a more detailed plan. Mahendra explained that there is an agreement among the three agencies to cooperate on this project. Larry asked if timelines were projected. Mahendra said timelines were not addressed, just that the agencies would be working together and what they will be doing. Every year the three agencies get together and prioritize the surveying of the counties.

Larry observed that from discussions in several meetings he has attended, he has gotten the impression that the goal of completing the soil survey of the state by the year 2003 is really not realistic. He wanted to know why the participating agencies do not project a more realistic completion date, expressing some concern about the loss of

credibility with the counties and the Legislature if the project continues to be incomplete for several years beyond projected date. Mahendra said that no one knows how long this will take. Larry agreed but pointed out that the general feeling seems to be that this project could not be completed by the 2003 target date. Mahendra explained that with one staff person from each agency working on this project, it is not possible to complete by the target date. If an additional staff person from each agency is added, then it can be reached.

Cliff Welsh commented that his understanding is that it is a money and staff issue. Larry reiterated that his concern is with the credibility of the Steering Committee if one date is advertised and it is not feasible. Cliff added that was his reason for asking if the Committee saw a need to accelerate this process. He does not know how much support there will be for accelerating the project, although he suspects there will be some support from an assessing standpoint. Most states have a parameter of a certain period of years. They do not want it strung out over a period of years.

Jim Merchant asked if the Committee was being asked to support a proposal to accelerate the process. Jim Brown said there will be some stuff that will come up in the budget review later in the meeting.

Larry said he did not put together a resolution for an Advisory Committee on the Soils database because it did not seem to be functional at this time.

Cadastral: Jim Brown reported that they are working on the cadastral database. They have a set of nomenclature that seems to be working very well. They have developed a methodology whereby they are combining GPS positional coordinates, surveying measurements acquired from the original BLM survey, surveying measurements acquired from all other sources, including the county, digitized information from whatever source and the DOQ's. This seems to be working well. They are on about the third adjustment run on Adams County and are moving into Dawson County. Jim Brown is intending to have some stuff at the NACO meeting, which should put him well in line to do a presentation on what they have at the December meeting. At that time, they hope to have the numbered system or the naming convention system for the Steering Committee to approve. If the Committee approves, it will be ready to be sent out to the county surveyors etc. for a naming convention system.

The quality of the positioning depends largely on the quality of the data. The worst case scenario where they only have digitized and original government measurement, which they have in all cases, they are hitting within about sixty feet. Any kind of survey or GPS measurement tightens that figure down quite a bit. They have been surprised at the amount of survey data in the county records and including that old survey data helps a lot in increasing accuracy. Utilizing that old data will cut down on the need for additional work.

Larry commented that he did not draft a resolution for this one because there was no perceived need for a study committee at this time.

Land Cover/Land Use: Jim Merchant said that there is nothing more to report than what is in the initial assessment from the last meeting. He proposed the Steering Committee adopt the resolution Larry drafted to form an Advisory Committee with the Conservation and Survey Division acting as the lead agency for that committee. Val Goodman seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #7*).

Property Parcels: Jim Brown reported that the Steering Committee made a contact with someone in the Property Tax Division to try to get moved getting data in for Dodge County. Larry suggested that it would be helpful if Jim Brown, Larry Zink and Bob Martin could get together and draft an initial assessment. It would be helpful to be able to include it in the Annual Report. Jim Brown added that Ethel Skinner should be involved as well.

EXECUTIVE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Draft Recommendations on GIS-related Agency Technology Plans: Jim Brown said that the Legislative Budget office transferred over the following agencies that they thought might have some GIS use; the Corn Development Board, Oil and Gas Commission, the State Surveyor's Office, Water Resources Department, Natural Resources Commission, Department of Roads, Department of Aeronautics, Game and Parks, Department of Education, and Department of Environmental Quality. The Executive Committee looked at all of these and there were a number of those that did not seem to have any GIS-related technology involved in their proposals. Department of Aeronautics,

Game and Parks, Department of Education, DEQ, Department of Roads and the State Surveyor's Office did not have any new projects proposed. There was some new development proposed in the Corn Development Board, the Natural Resources Commission, the Oil and Gas Commission, and the Water Resources Department.

The Corn Board: Larry explained that the Corn Board was asking for a computer and some GIS software and talking somewhat generally in terms of how they would be using it for marketing and such things. One of the concerns of the Executive Committee was they were talking about some databases that have not been created yet. There was some concern that they had not done enough analysis on it. The Executive Committee gave a neutral recommendation. Mahendra commented that they were looking at developing databases but they were only asking for a PC system. Jim Brown added that they doubted the databases were available to do the kind of work they wanted to do and they certainly did not have the funding to create them. Larry said that they also submitted a similar proposal to the Grant Funds for Small State Agencies and received the funding from that source.

Tom Lamberson noted that the big concern was the viability of being able to get what they were proposing for \$15,000. Jim Brown said that there are no databases for production or the markets.

Tom Lamberson moved that the Steering Committee accept the Executive Committee's draft recommendation on the Corn Board [Neutral from a GIS Utilization Perspective (No Recommendation)]. Jim Langtry seconded. The motion passed (*see vote # 8*).

Oil and Gas Commission: Jim Brown said that there was no request for funding that was particularly GIS related. There was a request for funding to increase the size of their server. There was some language that said that as a part of their new method of operation, they were going to try to get latitude and longitude on the location of the oil wells. There was no budget to look at or recommend. The Executive Committee stated that the Steering Committee supports the efforts in reference to their well locations, latitude and longitude, and urges them to coordinate their efforts with the GIS Steering Committee.

Val asked if they had a GIS at all. Jim Brown said they do not. Jim Langtry clarified that they were basically talking about building databases. Jim Brown explained that they already have a comprehensive database of wells. They do not have latitude and longitude but they do have regular heights on their wells. Jim Brown did not see any reference that they intend to begin doing any GIS work, but the latitude and longitude might make it available to someone else. Larry added that they are moving it into a new database structure that has been developed nationally.

Tom moved to adopt the Executive Committee's recommendation on the Oil and Gas Commission [Recommended from a GIS Utilization Perspective]. John Miyoshi seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #9*).

State Surveyor: Jim Brown said that there were no new GIS initiatives. He did request continued funding for the support to local counties in georeferencing in the 1999-2000 budget year. The Executive Committee noted that and added that the Steering Committee strongly supports the State Surveyor's office in the area of providing technical assistance, support, and advice to the counties. Larry pointed out that the Executive Committee did not use one of the four category recommendations because it was not a new project, but one in which the Steering Committee wanted to express continuing support.

Tom Lamberson moved to accept the Executive Committee's recommendation with one change. In the first sentence, it should be changed to say that the GIS Steering Committee believes a formal recommendation is unnecessary because the State Surveyor's GIS related initiatives do not represent new initiatives relative to the 1999-2001 budget. Jim Langtry seconded. Tom explained that he is making that proposal because the Corn Board does not have a recommendation listed because the Steering Committee does not believe their proposal is adequate. The reason the State Surveyor's initiative is not receiving a recommendation is because it is not a request for funding. The phrasing is identical and Tom does not want someone to look at the two recommendations and think that they are being made for the same reason. The motion passed (*see vote #10*).

Department of Water Resources: Jim Brown explained that this is definitely a request for the Department of Water Resources to move very heavily into the GIS arena. Their request was for one fairly good workstation, ArcInfo software, one GIS specialist and the supporting things that go along with that. They intend to do the water rights

database and the water wells as well. They have several data sets they use regularly and they intend to bring them into the GIS environment. Everyone on the Executive Committee felt that was a wonderful plan and highly recommended the proposal. Jim is attempting to get the Department of Water Resources more involved with the Steering Committee.

Mele noted that with respect to the absence of representation from the Department of Water Resources at this meeting, that they had intended to attend this meeting. Mike Thompson, from the Department of Water Resources, was called out of town on business relating to the Republican River. They had intended to represent themselves, but litigation called.

Mahendra added that the water wells and water rights databases are already available. They are GIS databases available to the NRC databank. Jim Brown said that they have borrowed equipment from the State Surveyors office to do some work down on the Republican River. They already have an operational ArcInfo system. They are ready to go into GIS whether this initiative goes through or not. Mele commented that the water rights are currently maintained by hand on a set of mylars. Their intent is to get that digital. Some of the mylars are not very accurate and they would like to get that upgraded.

Jim Brown said that part of their proposal was that they would be able to deal with the irrigation districts and their clients to bring this stuff in digitally so they would not have to go to the mylar.

Tom moved to accept the Executive Committee's recommendation regarding the Department of Water Resources proposal [Highly Recommended from an Overall GIS Implementation Perspective]. John Miyoshi seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #11*).

Natural Resources Commission, Soil Survey Mapping: Mahendra explained that this is a proposal to expedite the soil surveys to ensure completion by the year 2003. In order to do this, they will need one more person from each agency.

Jim Merchant asked if there was any indication from CSD that that was feasible for them. Mahendra could not say. Jim Merchant advocates moving the soil surveys forward quickly but is not optimistic that another person can be provided. They will do whatever they can.

Larry said that the Executive Committee's proposed recommendation on this is highly recommended.

Cliff Welsh moved to accept the Executive Committee's recommendation regarding the NRC's Soil Survey proposal. John Miyoshi seconded.

Tom expressed his understanding what was being proposed was a workstation, a disk drive and three additional ArcView licenses. Larry made a notation, following the Executive Committee meeting, that Tom understands as saying that the workstation will be used as a server and is not relevant to the ability to utilize an additional person or accelerate the process and therefore he revised the related comment. Larry explained that it was his initial understanding and his original draft comment language, that this workstation would be used not only as a server but also to facilitate having another person involved in the project. Larry indicated that Mahendra later informed him, in a phone conversation, that the hardware and software was not pivotal in getting another person involved and so Larry revised the comment wording related to the proposed recommendation.

Tom asked if the NRC was requesting funding for an additional workstation to service the server. Mahendra said it is a UNIX workstation and cannot be used by a person, it has to be used by a server. For a person, an NT or PC or Windows workstation is required. Because of the volume of data produced from the soil surveys a server reserved solely for the soil surveys is needed. With or without an additional person, another server is needed. The funds are for the server to make the information available over the Internet.

Tom clarified that the recommendation on the table has virtually nothing to do with accelerating the process. He is concerned that the Steering Committee know what it is recommending. His concern is about the workstation and how it fits into the picture of the soil survey acceleration. Mahendra said that the workstation is necessary whether the

work is accelerated or not. John Miyoshi commented that you can only run so many licenses on a server. Mahendra added that for the additional three licenses that were being requested, a server was needed.

Tom said that if that is the case, then the workstation is needed to accelerate the soil surveys, contrary to Larry's revised wording. Mahendra said that for the three licenses, the workstation is needed. Larry said that based on this exchange, he would return to his original wording, to make it clear the server is necessary for the additional people to function. The vote was called on the Executive Committee's draft recommendation and revised comment section [Highly Recommended from an Overall GIS Implementation Perspective]. The motion passed (*see vote #12*).

Natural Resources Commission, Development of the DRG Database: Jim Brown explained that digital raster graphics is essentially a raster image of the quarter minute quad. This is not a proposal to develop the information on the quarter minute quad, but more development of the quarter minute quad from new or existing information. Dayle Williamson made the statement in the budget proposal that the value to the State of this effort will have to be fully considered and further discussion is necessary. The Executive Committee does not see any reason to disagree with that. They are not sure what level of use the raster graphics image of the quad would be to the State. Jim Merchant observed that these maps are already available, the real question is what value there is in updating them.

Mele said that there was mention of the DLG's as separate. As he understands it, in order to process the DRG's all the different layers need to be put together. Mahendra said that there are no DLG's available for Nebraska. They are supposed to be separate. Mele asked if the DLG's would be available as a byproduct of this effort. Mahendra explained that they would not be called DLG's because they will not meet the USGS national standards. In order to expedite things, they will do things a little differently and call them by a different name.

Jim Merchant said that when the priority databases that the Steering Committee has committed to developing are considered, then the question becomes of what value are updated topographic maps. Virtually everything is going to be entered in these databases.

Jim Brown observed that this is more a cartographic product than a database.

Tom moved to accept the Executive Committee's proposed recommendation regarding the NRC's DRG proposal [Neutral from a GIS Utilization Perspective (No Recommendation)]. Jim Langtry seconded. The motion passed (*see vote #13*).

Revised DEM's and DOQ's: John Miyoshi asked why the DEM's and the DOQ's were not considered new products. Larry explained that the DEM's and DOQ's are considered new projects but there was some confusion in the Executive Committee about the interrelationships of them and the Executive Committee felt further discussion by the Steering Committee was needed. Jim Brown said that the DEM's and the DOQ's are a matched set. If one is done, the other is done.

Within the discussion, there was some concern expressed that the redirection of staff was feasible. With the staffing needs of the soil survey project, there was some question that there would be enough existing staff to do the work. In addition, there is no way of knowing what the 1999-2000 use of the DOQ's and DEM's might be. New versions become less of a priority when the old ones are available.

Larry stated his understanding of the Executive Committee's discussion, that all of the NRC's projects were to receive at least a rating of the recommended category and the question was which should be shifted up to the highly recommended category. Jim Brown emphasized the concern that this project would take resources away from the soil survey or other important projects. Larry added that if the Steering Committee highly recommends everything, then it becomes a meaningless category to those down the line who are acting on our recommendations.

Mahendra explained that currently there are three full time persons working on the DEM's and one working on the DOQ's. The NRC is estimating that this should not take any longer than a year at this level of staffing. After the end of the year, one person will be retained to continue working on the DEM's.

Larry asked what the interaction between the DEM's, DOQ's and the hydrography database. Mahendra said that this

would require some prioritizing work and that NRC categorizes revision of the DEM's and DOQ's as a higher priority than creating the hydrography database.

Larry said that he understood the NRC had agency goals and from that perspective NRC had placed a revision of the DEM's and DOQ's as a higher priority than the hydrology database. Larry indicated that he felt the Steering Committee was being asked to indicate the Steering Committee's relative priorities on these various projects. From that viewpoint, Larry proposed, that given the existence of 1993-based DOQ/DEMs, that the development of the soils and hydrology databases might have a higher priority, from the Steering Committee's perspective, than a revision of DOQ/DEMs.

John Miyoshi stated his agreement with Larry, while noting that both of these databases are important to the NRD's across the state. Miyoshi said that the 30-meter resolutions on the DEM's do not do NRDs a lot of good, while 10 meter resolution would. However, he felt that the updated DOQ/DEMs are not quite as high a priority as the hydrology database. Jim Brown maintained that the soils database has the highest priority. Jim reiterated his concern that NRC if all of these projects were high priority there was not enough reallocating full time employees to go around. If these are really going to be set up as a high priority, then the resources requested are not adequate. John said that the Commission has been rather creative about getting some outside help that they are not paying for. It is mostly a matter of having the hardware in place. Mahendra suggested ranking all the projects as highly recommended and letting the Commission look into it.

Tom indicated that he didn't want to argue for whether these should be ranked as highly recommended or recommended, but he believes it is important for the Steering Committee to send on a clear understanding of what the human resource needs are for these projects. In addition, the Committee needs to clarify precisely what the budgetary impact of these approving these proposals. There are things included in these budget requests that are not part of the actual proposals. He referred to the scanner, the costs for color-infrared photography, etc. Tom referred to discussions held in the Executive Committee regarding the interplay and mix of understandings upon which these of these various project and budget proposals were developed Tom felt would be helpful if the NRC could clarify for the next group exactly what is needed for each project. Larry noted that he had attempted to capture some of that discussion and those understandings in some separate draft comments [not reviewed or approved by Executive Committee] that he developed later. They were available as a separate handout for this meeting.

Mahendra explained that there were several funding requests, the amount of which depended on whether the USGS or other agencies would be participating with the NRC in the various projects

Larry commented he had recently spoken with Darryl Williams from the USGS who indicated that if the Commission is talking about essentially repeating the same/similar process that occurred before with the development of the DOQs/DEMs, then the USGS would likely be willing to participate again on the same basis.

John Miyoshi moved that both the revised DEM and DOQ database project be generally recommended [Recommended from a GIS Utilization Perspective]. Mahendra maintained these should be highly recommended because these are very important databases for the NRC and the NRD. Tom Lamberson seconded the motion. John added that as a user, these databases are very important to him and he feels his opinion is biased.

Larry asked if, as part of the motion, his draft, non-Executive Committee reviewed, comments should be submitted or if that needed to be dealt with as a separate motion. John and Tom found including the comments acceptable. The motion passed (see vote #14).

NRC – Hydrography Database: Jim Brown explained that the Executive Committee did not make a recommendation on this for many of the same reasons. In addition, they did not know how much this would help the Department of Water Resources. The Executive Committee urged the NRC, if they move into this to coordinate with the Department of Water Resources, DEQ and the Steering Committee. A big issue is, again, the redirection of the full time staff.

Larry asked if there was anything new in the budget for this proposal. Mahendra replied there is not.

Jim Merchant asked why this was referred to as a National Hydrography Database. Mahendra explained that is what the USGS is calling it. All the states are developing this database. Jim Merchant clarified that this was the Nebraska portion of a national database.

Tom indicated that he believes the Steering Committee would be short selling this database if it just identifying DWR in its comments. Taking into consideration the list of interested persons on the hydrology subcommittee, there are a lot of agencies that would potentially benefit from this database who are not identified. Larry explained that he only listed DWR and DEQ because they are the only ones who explicitly expressed interest. John added there would be a number of local uses, NRD's, counties and such who would benefit as well. Tom said that virtually every agency that deals with natural resources issues will have a significant interest in the database.

Tom moved to highly recommend the hydrography database with Larry's draft comment included, but amended to include a list of the local agencies, Roads and NGPC who will benefit. John seconded.

The motion passed (*see vote #15*).

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE: Jim Brown said that the NACO Annual Conference will be December 1-3. The State Surveyor's office, through the initiative to provide assistance, has requested a booth. He has informed NACO that if the Steering Committee have its own booth, he would like to have it next to the State Surveyor's booth. Larry inquired whether there was general support for having a Steering Committee booth at the NACO Conference again this year. There was general support expressed and a since that a vote was not necessary. Larry asked if Duane Stott was interested in making his presentation again. Duane agreed. The Committee agreed to pay Duane's expenses.

Jim Merchant reported that Larry Worrell and Jim Brown made arrangements with the Professional Surveyor's Association to financially back the Steering Committee's May 1999 conference. Larry W. was supposed to sign a contract with the hotel this week or next. Right now, the conference is scheduled for May 11 and 12 at the Cornhusker.

There is a committee of about 12 or so who are working on this project and the GIS/LIS Association Planning Committee. The next meeting will be October 8 at 1:30. The newsletter has been held up because they wanted to be certain the hotel was secured. There should be a newsletter out this month with additional details. They are making progress and would like to discuss the details of the program at the next meeting.

FGDG/METADATA: Erik Hubl said that on July 15 Jerry Odum had sent out an email about a draft document created by ISO, the International Standards Organization, which deals with metadata. The FGDC created the current version was looking for people to read this document and send in comments for review. Because Erik is on the Standards Committee, he felt obligated to get involved. On August 20, Richard Piersall from the USGS notified Erik that he had been selected to go to an adjudication of the comments that were being submitted.

The meeting was held in USGS headquarters at Rushton, Virginia. There were representatives from NASA, USGS, the Army, Louisiana State University, Miter Corporation, Harris Corporation, Montana State Library Commission, Coeur d'Alene Tribe in Idaho and Erik, representing local government. There had been over 250 comments had been submitted and had to be grouped and ranked and combined into singular comments to represent FGDC's point of view on the ISO's version of metadata.

At the end of the week, the task force's chairperson, Richard Piersall, took their review and flew to Beijing, China to attend the annual ISO conference where their adjudicated comments were discussed. The review that the task force did will be formally submitted to ANSI, American National Standards Institute. ANSI will formally submit these comments to ISO. ISO has plans to formally adopt these standards in June of 1999. FGDC will likely adopt that standard the following year.

Participating in the adjudication of the comments has allowed Erik a glimpse of the future of metadata in Nebraska. Several statements are clear. FGDC plans to adopt the ISO metadata standards which will replace version 2 currently used that was adopted June 1998. All concurrent GIS data developed with federal funds must comply with FGDC's

adopted version. FGDC is aware of the huge investment of existing metadata that is being developed and will seek to ensure tools are being developed to allow for the migration of existing metadata into the ISO version. FGDC is making some significant funding available to those agencies wishing to develop metadata profiles and tools to help facilitate that. In particular, they are targeting universities as groups to provide funding for to develop some of these tools. Until that time, they recommend continuing to use FGDC 2.0 Metadata Standards, adopted June 1998.

ANNUAL REPORT: Larry said that he plans to include already drafted documents as much as possible. The main report that needs to be developed is an update on the PLSS Pilot Project. In his outline, Larry listed topics that will probably need to be addressed. In the past, the Executive Committee has reviewed the Annual Report and given comments and a summary recommendation to the Steering Committee. Due to timing issues, Larry suggested an Executive Committee meeting be scheduled in the later part of October because the Committee wanted to approve the Annual Report at the November meeting.

Mahendra requested soil surveys be added to the data base development category. Larry indicated that it was an oversight on his part and would be included. Jim Merchant suggested that Larry do some revision of the outline based on the discussion done at this meeting. For example, land cover does not need to specifically need to be on there. Larry indicated that in this category, he was not referring to the new land cover/land use efforts, but reporting on the database developed as part of the GAP analysis.

FEDERAL AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE: Larry explained he has been struggling with how to move forward with this. He proposed the next move is to try to get federal agency representatives together so they can share and brief each other on what they are doing and discuss as a group who they would nominate as a representative to the Steering Committee. Because they do not seem to have a meeting of any type, Larry would like to send out a letter inviting representatives from several federal agencies to an expanded forum on November 12. A brief presentation about what they are doing with geospatial data in Nebraska and a sharing among themselves and the Steering Committee. At the same time, there would be a room set aside for more organizational discussions about someone they might nominate to the Steering Committee and if there is interest in getting together in the future. Larry concluded that he has been struggling with how to get some sort of gathering going since they do not have one.

Larry said there was interest at the upper levels of federal agencies in making this happen. They do not know how to make it happen. He has also been trying to suggest that the federal representative to the Steering Committee also take on the responsibility of coordinating other meetings with different federal agencies.

John suggested adding Sandra Washington from National Parks. Jim Brown added that if anyone knows of any contact that will be of benefit to let Larry know. Half of the battle is finding the right person.

Jim Merchant recommended that if this does not work, the Steering Committee determine which agencies they deal with the most and then select someone. He thought it would be USGS, NRCS and NGS. The federal agencies should be given the opportunity to select their representative but if that does not work, then the Committee needs to invite someone to take that role. Jim Brown agreed but commented that overlooks a federal representative who attends all the Steering Committee meetings, Jerry Odum from the NGS. Larry said that the issue seems to be finding someone who is willing to make a commitment to be an ongoing facilitator of these gatherings. There was general support for the approach Larry was suggesting. [Note: since the Steering Committee meeting, the federal representatives forum and meeting has been rescheduled to Wednesday, November 18th, 1:00 pm, East Campus Union.]

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS UPDATES ON THEIR AGENCY GIS EFFORTS: Mahendra reported that the DEM's are 93% complete and the DOQ's are 75% complete. Jim Brown added there is a new ftp site for the DOQ's have moved. Jim Merchant asked if that site was noted on the webpage. Jim Brown said it was not.

Jim Brown said that their base station in Grand Island has been giving them some problems with survey quality data. It seems to be a computer problem. They intend to upgrade that computer.

The Grand Island base station has processed 2900 requests for file downloads in the past year. Lincoln's base station processed between 700-900 and Scotts Bluff processed 200.

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be November 12, 1998 at 1:00 PM.

Vote Tallies for 10/1/98 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting										
	Roll call	Min. #1	MPLIS #2	Adv. Cmte Co-spons. #3	Gov. Units Adv. Cmte. #4	DOQ/DEM Adv. Cme. #5	Hydro Adv. Cmte. #6	Land Cov. Adv. Cmte. #7	Corn Bd. Recom. #8	Oil & Gas Recom. #9
DAS - Rick Becker	A
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling	P	+	+	+	+	+	—	+	+	+
CSD - Mark Kuzila, Jim Merchant, Les Howard	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NGPC - Mele Koneya Bruce Sackett	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
NRC - Dayle Williamson Mahendra Bansal	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PRO - Yvonne Norton- Leung	A
PTD - Cathy Lang Bob Martin	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DOR - Dick Genrich Jon Ogden	A
St. Surv - Jim Brown	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LRD - Val Goodman	A/P	+	+	+	+	+
Federal Rep.
John Miyoshi	A/P	.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Blaine Dinwiddie Steve Larson	P/A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cliff Welsh	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lash Chaffin	A
Duane Stott	P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dennis Wilson	A
TOTALS	9 - P / 12 - P	9 - +	11 - +	11 - +	11 - +	12 - +	11 - + 1 - —	12 - +	12 - +	12 - +

"P"=present, "A"=absent, "+"=voting for, "—"=voting against, "NV"=not voting

Vote Tallies for 10/1/98 GIS Str. Cmte. Meeting										
	St. Surv. Recom. #10	Water Res. Recom. #11	NRC Soils Recom. #12	NRC DRG Recom. #13	NRC DOQ DEM Recom. #14	NRC Hydro Recom. #15	#16	#17	#18	#19
DAS - Rick Becker
DEQ - Tom Lamberson Dennis Burling	+	+	+	+	+	+
CSD - Mark Kuzila, Jim Merchant, Les Howard	+	+	+	+	+	+
NGPC - Mele Koneya Bruce Sackett	+	+	+	+	+	+
NRC - Dayle Williamson Mahendra Bansal	+	+	NV	NV	NV	NV
PRO - Yvonne Norton- Leung
PTD - Cathy Lang Bob Martin	+	+	+	+	+	+
DOR - Dick Genrich Jon Ogden
St. Surv - Jim Brown	+	+	+	+	+	+
LRD - Val Goodman	+	+	+	+	+	+
Federal Rep.
John Miyoshi	+	+	+	+	+	+
Blaine Dinwiddie Steve Larson	+	+	+	+
Cliff Welsh	+	+	+	+	+	+
Larry Worrell Jim Langtry	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lash Chaffin
Duane Stott	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dennis Wilson
TOTALS	12 - +	12 - +	11 - + 1 - NV	11 - + 1 - NV	10 - + 1 - NV	10 - + 1 - NV

"P"=present, "A"=absent, "+"=voting for, "-"=voting against, "NV"=not voting