

# NC ONEMAP GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

January 23, 2012

2:00 to 3:00 PM

OITS-333 Six Forks Road

Conference Room 4

## MINUTES

Attending: Lee Mandell, Jerry Fralick, Tim Johnson, Bob Brinson, Anne Payne, Julie Stamper, John Farley, Brett Spivey, David Giordano, Jeff Brown and on the phone, Linda Rimer

Action items from this meeting:

- CGIA will continue to develop the NC OneMap Data Explorer with a target for TAC review of the next iteration on February 3, and a goal of releasing Version 1 on March 1.
- As voted by the Committee, CGIA will convert geospatial datasets in the NC OneMap Database and related map services from Metric (meters) to English (feet) map units.
- CGIA will continue to draft content for the outline of the NC OneMap Business Plan discussed today.
- CGIA will contact Marc Burris of the State Board of Elections to discuss current and potential roles for geospatial technology in business processes relating to elections.

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

2. Current Status of NC OneMap Program [Brett, David]

a. Operational Status: Servers, Connections, Data Releases

The latest data release is county boundaries from NC Geodetic Survey (new custodians in collaboration with NCDOT)

b. Usage Statistics

David reported that server hits dipped around the holidays.

On a server topic, CGIA, with assistance from Esri, solved the technical issue that enabled download of more than 20 orthoimagery tiles at a time. (There is a planned limit to assure that the server does not get overloaded with files in a queue for distribution.).

3. Review of Goals and Priorities for Next 90 Days [Brett, David]

a. Staff Enhancements to NC OneMap

New Data Explorer/Viewer Status – Brett reported that the work continues on the data explorer.

The goal is to release to the TAC by February 3 and receive comments within a few days.

Release is set for March 1. Lee noted that the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on IT saw a snapshot of the first iteration. Lee appreciated the hard work.

b. TAC Activities [Colleen]

Colleen reported by email:

The TAC met on December 21, 2011 discussed several topics.

- Discussed NC One Map program and an appropriate role for TAC per discussions with M&O the previous day.
- Reviewed the latest version of the data explorer
  - o Looks really good; TAC sees it as close to being a finished version 1
  - o Identified 4 items to be completed prior to the beginning of TAC testing: add identify, reorder/remove layers, print, help/basic intro instructions
- Reviewed the gap analysis documentation
  - o The majority of items on the requirements list have been handled with the Geospatial Portal and the new viewer.

Next Steps

- David and Brett will work on the data explorer to complete the 4 identified items. Will send to TAC to begin testing as soon as these are finished.
- TAC members will receive and review the ITS technical standard document from John Farley and the current NC OneMap architecture from David and Brett. The purpose is to make recommendations, as needed, to shore up the architecture and foundation.
- Recommend at the next M&O meeting that the State adopt State Plane Coordinate Feet as the standard for data and map services. Agencies are currently maintaining in feet and having to convert to meters just for NC OneMap.

The committee discussed the last item in the TAC report. The majority of geospatial data users in local governments and state agencies use feet as a map unit (not sure about private users). David confirmed that it would be practical to meet the technical requirements for converting datasets in the NC OneMap database from meters to feet. David and Tim explained that the GICC issued a “Statement of Direction” that recognized NAD 1983 State Plane Coordinates as a standard with map units as meters or, alternatively, feet (November 9, 2005). Consequently, the GICC does not need to act for the NC OneMap database to convert datasets from meters to feet. John has a standard for datum used by DOT that we will share.

The committee voted to change the published map services to NAD 1983 State Plane feet and instructed CGIA to implement the conversion. David advised that CGIA convert the NC OneMap database underlying the services, and the committee concurred.

#### 4. Strategic Business Plan [Jeff, Tim]

a. NC OneMap Program Components – no additional editing of components discussed in the last meeting

b. NC OneMap Explanatory Document – no additional editing of the document discussed in the last meeting

#### c. Moving from Crosswalk to Roadmap

Jeff presented a draft outline for an NC OneMap Business Plan. As part of the forthcoming State GIS Strategy, the outline for the NC OneMap plan is intended as a framework for integrating the work of the committee on NC OneMap revitalization, objectives and goals, accountability measures, analysis of priority datasets, communications, pillars of participation, program components, GIS inventory, metadata, and other elements presented in the crosswalk between goals and plan elements. The business plan is intended to serve as a roadmap.

Jeff pointed out that a State GIS Strategy will include elements of the NC OneMap Business Plan and the Business Plan for Orthoimagery. Lee agreed and added that a State GIS Strategy will cover the breadth of coordination work, will be concise, and will refer to large pieces. He stated his expectation that other parts of the State GIS Strategy will not need a business plan, but the plans for orthoimagery and NC OneMap will be key references.

Regarding the outline, Jerry suggested that the elements not be grouped in Section IV (Crosswalk to Roadmap) to be consistent with the matrix for easier reference. Lee asked for time for the committee to review the business plan outline, but urged CGIA to proceed on drafting content for the sections.

## 5. Accountability Measures [Lee]

Lee described an example set of measure descriptors for measure 2.3b (prepared by Jeff) as a test of the draft set of items that he provided (see handout, with measure types listed on page 2). Jeff interpreted Measure 2.3b to an “effectiveness measure” related to map services and satisfaction of business needs. Jeff recommended that a similar measure (from the same survey) relating to downloadable datasets would be informative. The rationale is that many users prefer to download data for more flexibility in analysis and cartography and for field uses that lack consistent online connectivity. Meeting business needs for those users is valuable as well as for users of map services.

John urged the group to emphasize “map services” and “feature services” as an ever more practical way for users to apply data to their own projects; storing copies of downloaded datasets is inefficient and is not the preferred direction for data access. John noted that there are some training/information issues for some users who currently prefer downloads, but it might be better not to measure satisfaction with data download as an ongoing accountability measure.

Lee encouraged documenting the measures in this way; it helps us to think about how to improve, combine, or add measures. For example, should we have an efficiency measure for NC OneMap? Lee recognized that describing measures is somewhat tedious, but the process is very informative. He acknowledged that accountability measures are not as important as our work on NC OneMap and imagery, but as we have time to work on it, we will benefit by progress on this.

The group had no specific suggestions on changing the set of items drafted by Lee.

## 6. Policy Issues from Group

Julie raised an issue of application of GIS to voting districts and voting. She noted that the process for setting the boundaries of voting districts relies heavily on GIS, but local voting systems accept text based assignment and require manual work. In her experience, local election officials are not taking advantage of geospatial technology. The determination of who votes where is very inefficient. Local boards of election use State-issued software. Bob added that state-provided software comes from the State Board of Elections. Lee and Tim reminded the group that Marc Burris, IS Director of the State Board of Elections, was very interested in serving on the GICC, and the proposed legislation regarding GICC membership included the addition of a seat for the State Board of Elections. The group agreed that Marc Burris should be engaged on this issue.

Anne noted that Census geography has come a long way, but it is still problematic related to county datasets. Apparently, the State Board of Elections insists that local governments use Census geography (the basis for redistricting). There are improvements to be made (in data consistency) in future collaborative efforts between local governments and the Bureau of the Census.

7. Action Items [Lee] – none pending.

8. Future Meeting Dates – February 20, March 19, April 16, and May 21 in conjunction with M&O Committee meetings.