



North Carolina  
Geographic Information Coordinating Council  
Local Government Committee

MINUTES  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE  
December 7, 2011

PROCEEDINGS

The quarterly meeting of the Local Government Committee (LGC), a committee of the Geographic Information Coordinating Council (GICC), was held on December 7, 2011.

PRESENT

LGC members:

Gene Hume, Buncombe County, representing Carolina URISA  
Chris Kolytk, Moore County, representing NCLGISA  
Alex Rickard, Eastern Carolina Council, representing ARCED  
Jerry Simmons, Pender County, representing NCPMA  
Julie Stamper, Pasquotank County, representing NCACC

Others:

James Armstrong, Richmond County, SMAC Rep  
Alice Wilson, City of New Bern, SMAC Rep  
Jeff Brown, CGIA Coordination Program Manager (for part of meeting)  
Tom Tribble, CGIA, Staff to the LGC

ABSENT

Kathryn Clifton, City of Salisbury, representing NCLM

REPORTS

Statewide Mapping Advisory Committee (SMAC)

Alice Wilson said that the State Government GIS Users Committee (SGUC) continues to work on a statewide spatial architecture but without much progress.

As requested by the LGC and in light of the problems with the EPA grant for seamless parcels, Alice expressed concern about the process for applying for grants and ensuring that the scope of work are consistent with the goals of the GICC and its committees. She proposed a set of guidelines and a process for reviewing and endorsing grant proposals in support of GICC initiatives. She reported that Anne Payne, chair of the SMAC, and Tim Johnson will consider this idea at a later time.

She also reported to the SMAC the LGC's interest in the availability of color infrared imagery through the orthoimagery acquisition projects.

The issue of LightSquared was a major topic of discussion at the SMAC. The LGC used a LGC Alert to notify the local government GIS community about this issue and to encourage agencies to submit letters to the Federal Communications Commission. James Armstrong added that the FCC has asked the Air Force to test how the LightSquared ground based transmitters will affect high end GPS units. Tom Tribble reported the GICC expressed their appreciation to the LGC for generating letters of concern to the FCC. He estimated that about a dozen letters were generated through the LGC's efforts. At the GICC meeting, Gary Thompson, NC Geodetic Survey, reported that one GPS manufacturer has developed an antenna with a filter that reportedly will remove the interference from the LightSquared ground based transmitters. However, this is just one GPS company and the cost to government and private sector to replace existing GPS receivers would be astronomical. Gary also reported that the outcome of the waiver request is still uncertain but that he expects some resolution in early 2012. Julie Stamper noted that based on media reports that she has seen that LightSquared seems to be increasingly on the defensive.

The NC OneMap Geospatial Portal received praise at the SMAC meeting. Alice noted that the search tool is great and recommends that everyone try it.

The FIC rep to the SMAC reported that LiDAR data was collected in coastal areas after Hurricane Irene. Gary Thompson at NC Geodetic Survey ([gary.thompson@ncdenr.gov](mailto:gary.thompson@ncdenr.gov)) will be happy to share the data.

The US Board on Geographic Names approved name changes for four creeks based on recommendations previously submitted by the NC Board on Geographic Names. Two other name changes are under review, one in Ashe County for Hippiie Creek and another for a feature in Wake County.

The Working Group for Roads and Transportation is making progress on a railroads layer. Rick Crews from DOT is taking the lead. The initial focus is on the location of the lines and the ownership. The WGRT asked for assistance from the SMAC in developing attribute standards that meet customer needs.

The Working Group on Standards is getting underway. While the committee will have permanent members, the committee will add people with expertise in specific topic areas as it reviews or considers standards.

The Working Group for Standards is working on new LiDAR collection standards. A draft will be presented to the SMAC in January. If approved it will be presented to the GICC in February and then to the Office of the Secretary of State.

John Lay with NC Office of Geospatial and Technology Management reported that the Floodplain Mapping Program is working on a number of activities including the collection of ground based LiDAR for major roads in flood zones. They will start with the 23 coastal counties and work westward – no estimate on when this work will be completed. They have completed the collection, using a radio inclinometer, of first floor elevation for structures in the 50-year flood zone for 23 coastal counties. They now have attribute information for parcel structures, including replacement costs. FMP expects to release a new web application with which a user can enter an address and get a list of all risks.

Water and Sewer Standard – James reported that the SMAC approved the revised standard and submitted it to the GICC for adoption at its Nov 9 meeting. It was adopted. The LGC members cheered. James also noted that a Best Practices document was also prepared and is now available on both the GICC and NC OneMap websites. James expressed his appreciation to the ad hoc committee that did the work. The committee was mostly comprised of local government representatives. He also expressed his appreciation to Jeff Brown, CGIA Coordination Program Manager, for his help in guiding the process.

The standard has now moved from the “coverage” world to the Geodatabase world. In retrospect, James feels that despite all the hard work, some areas may have been overlooked. He noted that he is serving on the new Working Group for Standards, chaired by Tom Morgan, and the committee may revisit the new standard at some point to address areas that were overlooked. Julie thanked James for his hard work on this effort. Tom also commended James for his persistence and patience in a long process. He noted that the outcome was not simply a revised standard but recognition of the need for a Best Practices document, of which this is the first example. Tom recommended that anyone working on water and sewer data should review that document. A third outcome was the recognition of the need for a new protocol for reviewing standards, which led to the creation of the Working Group for Standards. Tom said the outcomes are a feather in the cap of the LGC because the effort came up from the LGC.

James said that he had been contacted by several people about the standard. He said that a person from the coast reported that they use vacuum systems on their sewers as opposed to force mains. The revised standard does not address vacuum systems, which may need to be considered in the next review. Tom asked that James share those comments with Jeff Brown and Tom.

Census Working Group – Alice reported that the US Census Bureau has scheduled four presentations in North Carolina on Boundary and Annexation Survey submittals. The workshops will be held in Winston-Salem, Waynesville, Charlotte and Wilmington, December 13-16. Tom reported that dates, locations and links to information about the workshops are in the Calendar of Events on the GICC and NC OneMap websites. The working group will hold off on meeting until after these workshops. Julie said the NCPMA also has a census committee and suggested that there needs to be some coordination between the groups.

**Action Item** – Alice will make sure that Tom Morgan, chair of the ad hoc census working group, is aware of the NCPMA activity and the need to work together.

Technology Advisory Committee – Tom reported for Tobin Bradley, the new LGC representative to the TAC. Tom reported that he received comments from Colleen Sharpe, chair of the TAC, and Jeff Brown that Tobin is a wonderful addition to the TAC. Tobin brings a lot of technical knowledge.

The TAC met on November 22. The NC OneMap technical team gave the first demonstration of the NC OneMap viewer prototype. The plan is to develop the viewer using an Agile project management approach, using a series of iterations involving demonstrations, review, criticisms, and revisions. Tobin believes that the technology direction – moving from a Flash to a HTML/Java Script map interface and using Web Mercator to facilitate broad basemap options – is the correct approach. Tobin described the technology direction as perfect. The TAC discussed some of the user interface aspects that are not fully developed, as would be expected in an early prototype. Tobin said that from a developer/designer perspective, the technical team is doing a fantastic job.

The second iteration will be demonstrated at the December 22 TAC meeting. Tom noted that he has not seen the prototype but understands that it will be radically different than the existing viewer and will reflect the recommendations that came out of pre-planning project in which the LGC participated.

Tobin reported that the TAC had some additional recommendations, specifically 1) develop a clear, concise definition of NC OneMap so that the TAC understands the purpose of the viewer; and 2) define the criteria for success so that the TAC will know when the viewer meets the documented requirements. Tom said that the complete TAC minutes are on the GICC website.

The NC OneMap team has committed to demonstrate the latest prototype of the viewer at the February 8 GICC meeting. This will be the first public viewing. Tom is uncertain if a final release date is scheduled.

Working Group for Roads and Transportation (WGRT) – Alex Rickard reported that the WGRT is very close to finalizing a contract between Eastern Carolina Council and a company named The Carbon Project to build the web-based translator for street

centerline data. NC DOT has approved the proposed scope of work. Only a few details regarding project timelines and milestones remain to be finalized.

Alex reported that the Working Group for Seamless Parcels is excited about this opportunity and is considering the possibility of working with The Carbon Project to expand the centerline translator to work with parcels. He noted that the tool could possibly be adapted to use with other datasets such as address points.

Alex expects a contract to be in place within a couple of weeks. A translator tool should be available in Beta format by April and completed by the end of June. Tom said “woohoo!” Julie echoed that sentiment and praised Alex for his great work and his persistence, noting that the effort has been underway for 2-3 years.

Working Group for Orthophotography Planning (WGOP) – Chris Koltyk reported on the WGOP meeting on October 11. He reported that the LiDAR standard is in final draft form. WGOP will review and hopefully approve the standard in early January and will then submit it to the SMAC. As noted earlier, if approved by the SMAC, it will be submitted to the GICC in February and then to the Office of the Secretary of State.

Chris reported on the 2012 orthoimagery project, which will cover 25 coastal counties. The Request for Qualifications was released on September 22 with submissions due by October 12. Chris said that 43 vendors attended an information session. (*Post meeting note – the vendors were selected in November. The list is available here:*

[http://www.cgia.state.nc.us/Portals/0/documents/Coastal\\_Orthoimagery\\_2012\\_Selected\\_Firms\\_Announcement.pdf](http://www.cgia.state.nc.us/Portals/0/documents/Coastal_Orthoimagery_2012_Selected_Firms_Announcement.pdf))

Flights are expected to occur in the February/March 2012 time frame. Quality control should be complete by February 2013 with data distribution to begin immediately thereafter. The project should be complete by May 2013. In early 2012, the NC 911 Board will consider funding the second cycle covering about 25 counties in the Piedmont area.

Chris raised several issues with the WGOP. One is that in 2010 three vendors acquired imagery for Moore County. Chris’s staff did extensive quality assessment of the data and discovered that most of the problems occurred along the boundaries between the three vendors. Apparently Moore County was the only county that had three vendors acquiring imagery.

Chris expressed some disappointment in local response to quality control. Only a small percentage of the counties responded to the QA/QC opportunity at the end of the project. For the 2012 project, a plan is being considered to include counties in the QA/QC process during the project rather than after the data is released. Julie reported that she spoke to Tom Morgan and she believes this is a done deal. Chris noted that one complicating factor is that the NC 911 Board is the client. Therefore, the data must be delivered to the E911 coordinators first, rather than the county GIS coordinators. Chris feels that it is

important that the GIS coordinators have the opportunity to do QA/QC early in the process and perhaps identify and resolve issues before the data is released.

On another topic, the National Elevation Assessment report is expected in January. The LGC responded to a survey on this topic earlier in the year. The goal is to request funding for a national program to acquire elevation data. An assessment by NOAA indicates that the benefits of a national elevation dataset are valued at \$4B.

Tom reported that Tim Johnson attended the National States Geographic Information Council annual meeting. It was reported that an effort is underway to develop a national contract for imagery. Details are unavailable. Whether this approach will work for North Carolina will require study. State and local agencies might have to give up some things to participate. The GICC will track this. Chris noted that local governments had to give up some things when the NC 911 Board funding the current approach in NC. He suggested that NC track the effort to determine if it will have benefits to local governments. Jerry Simmons noted that the NC 911 Board effort will unfortunately not include CIR imagery. Chris said that he has more detailed minutes of the WGOP meeting if anyone wants them.

#### GICC AND M&O REPORT

Julie was unable to attend the GICC meeting and Chris to do this report. Chris reported on the “Responding to Hurricane Irene” presentation. He said that several local, state and federal agencies talked about their preparation and response to the hurricane, including Alice Wilson for the City of New Bern. The presentations were inspiring and demonstrated the value of using GIS and the cooperation that occurred among agencies. Data were widely accessible and shared by many agencies.

Alice recommended that the members visit a USGS website that shows hurricane storm surge and wind data (<http://wim.usgs.gov/stormtidemapper/stormtidemapper.html#>) covering the east coast. Tom said that the LGC was well represented by Alice, who gave a fascinating presentation on how New Bern coped with a very difficult event.

Working Group for Seamless Parcels (WGSP) – Julie said that the EPA grant is raising more emotions at M&O meetings than any topic she can remember. She asked Tom to give an update from the GICC meeting.

Tom reminded the members that in 2009 DENR was awarded a \$500,000 grant by EPA to develop a translation tool to develop a statewide seamless dataset for parcels. The plan was to hire a private sector contractor to develop a data exchange software tool similar to the path of the WGRT for street centerlines. DENR has declined to manage the grant, in large part because they lost Julia Harrell’s position as well as much of their GIS infrastructure in the latest state budget cuts. DNER may be forced to return the money.

After the budget cuts, CGIA was asked to consider taking over management of the grant. CGIA declined because CGIA does not have the resources or the open source software

expertise to successfully complete the scope of work. Julia Harrell's time was going to be part of DENR's in-kind contribution to the grant. CGIA does not have funded positions to cover the in-kind obligations.

The M&O continues to look for other options to salvage the grant. DOT was asked to review the scope of work and concluded that an additional \$250,000 to \$500,000 would be required to complete the scope of work. DOT was also concerned about the subsequent maintenance costs. DOT declined to manage the grant. John Farley said at the GICC meeting that DOT might be able to contribute some funds to the effort. He estimates that DOT spends about \$50,000 in staff time annually to acquire and manage parcel data from counties. DOT clearly recognizes the value of a statewide parcel database.

Linda Rimer, chair of the FIC and the EPA liaison to North Carolina, reached out to EPA staff in Washington and Atlanta and said EPA is willing to meet and discuss changes in the scope of work.

The barrier in terms of cost is that the proposal is committed to developing an open source solution. Given that 97 of the 100 NC counties use Esri software, forging an open source solution might best meet North Carolina's needs and reduce the cost of developing the tool. If EPA is not committed to an open source solution, then a renegotiation of the scope of work may be possible. In that event, either CGIA or DOT may reconsider managing the grant

Everyone involved, including the M&O and the Office of State Budget & Management, recognizes the value of the project and the benefits that will accrue and are committed to saving the project. Several of the GICC members noted the support for the project from NCPMA in developing the grant. At one point more than 35 counties volunteered to participate in the effort to test the tool as it is developed. The project can be a cornerstone for developing a tool and protocols for statewide datasets built on local government data.

Tom had no recent news but said that every effort was being made to salvage the grant and that the M&O is working to arrange a meeting with EPA. Julie reported that at the last M&O meeting it was reported that The Carbon Project may be able to do the work outlined in the EPA grant for less money because they have already made technical progress in this area. She indicated that the M&O was guardedly optimistic about finding a solution. Julie praised the work of Tom Morgan in keeping the project alive.

Alex asked if there has been any discussion about revising endorsement procedures by the GICC and its committees for future proposals. Alice reported that she raised the issue at the SMAC meeting and that Anne Payne and Tim Johnson would revisit this concern. Julie was pleased that the GICC recognizes the role that local governments have played in this long process and recognizes that losing the project could damage coordination efforts with local governments and does not want to see that happen.

Jeff Brown joined the meeting. Julie asked if he had recent information on the EPA grant. Jeff indicated that the M&O is expecting a report from Tom Morgan and John Farley on a new approach on how The Carbon Project work on street centerlines could dovetail with the EPA grant work. He indicated there are technical issues involved but also administrative issues to be solved, including the possible designation of The Carbon Project as the sole source contractor.

NC GICC Annual Report – Tom reminded the members that the GICC issues an annual report to the Governor and the General Assembly. It documents the accomplishments of the GICC and its committees. Among other items, the 2011 report highlights the 2010 statewide orthoimagery report, the Business Plan for Orthoimagery and the release of the NC OneMap Geospatial Portal. Tom said that the LGC was intimately involved to all these activities. The report also recognizes projects and applications by the NC GIS community and several local governments were cited. The report includes an action plan for 2012. So that LGC members can best represent and inform their constituencies, Tom encouraged members to read the report at the GICC web site.

Julie said that activities in response to Hurricane Irene were included in the 2011 report even though the hurricane struck after the fiscal year ended. The acquisition of post-hurricane imagery by DOT and NOAA and the release of that imagery on the Geospatial Portal two days after the hurricane struck was an important accomplishment. The imagery was of great value to many agencies as they responded to the storm. She said that there was value in not waiting a year to promote these activities to the General Assembly.

Continuing the GICC report, Julie reported that Steve Strader, USGS liaison to North Carolina, is retiring and received a plaque from the GICC expressing its appreciation for his work over the years. She suggested that the LGC send Steve a letter of appreciation. The LGC members agreed. Alex suggested that the letter include mention of his support of the WGRT work. Steve's help as the liaison to USGS and FGDC officials in Washington to finalize the scope of work and contract details for the FGDC grant was invaluable.

**Action Item** – Tom with draft of letter of appreciation to Steve Strader and send it to Julie and Alex for review. Julie will send the letter.

## METADATA DISCUSSION

Jeff Brown opened the discussion by saying that he just left a Webinar by the FGDC on metadata. He appreciates the opportunity to get input from the LGC on metadata. He said the discussion is timely, particularly with the release of the NC OneMap Geospatial Portal, which relies on key word searches, which in turn is relies on good metadata records to discover data and services that stream data. The NC OneMap Governance Committee, which oversees the revitalization of NC OneMap, recognizes that metadata is critical in support of data discovery and access.

He just learned during the Webinar that federal agencies are beginning to move away from the current metadata standard to the new International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard. They are looking for ways to transform records from FRDC to ISO, to develop tools for creating and maintaining metadata in the ISO format and to create a XML schema to validate records. There is no immediate pressure to adopt the ISO standard but federal agencies are moving in that direction. Jeff noted that GIS software vendors, including Esri, may be moving in the direction of using the ISO software.

Given the release of the Geospatial Portal, the movement to a new ISO standard and the possible development of new software tools, the timing is right to discuss metadata.

The LGC addressed several questions.

*Are you creating and maintaining metadata? If not, why not.*

Gene Hume reported that Buncombe County has been creating metadata for about five years, beginning when Janet Lowe was GIS Coordinator. Maintenance is irregular. Buncombe County makes almost all of their data available for free download from their web site. Metadata is included before data is loaded for download and this provides impetus for creating the metadata. Gene uses ArcCatalog, mostly in ArcGIS 9.2 or 9.3. They have not created metadata since moving to ArcGIS 10.0.

Alex Rickard, Eastern Carolina Council (ECC), creates metadata but not for every single layer. He uses ArcCatalog or Tkme, a metadata editor tool. Many of the files he creates are “dummy” files, strictly for internal mapping purposes. ECC does not typically create and maintain long term datasets, such as parcels or centerlines or address points. The data are not typically available for distribution or data sharing in the way that counties or cities may do. Most are transportation related, such as for a bypass project, and are used for internal analysis. Internal GIS staff may not be the end user of these datasets so ECC creates basic metadata so that users will know its source and that it is not the official DOT centerline dataset. Mostly the metadata provides a disclaimer for liability issues. ECC uses a template in Tkme, which is imported and then tweaked for the project specifics in ArcCatalog. ECC uses ArcGIS 9.3 and 10.0.

James Armstrong, Richmond County, creates metadata for many of the layers in their SDE. Maintenance is irregular but he did create metadata for the base layers about 18 months ago.

Chris Koltyk, Moore County, has metadata for certain base layers such as parcels and orthos that date back to earlier CGIA and FGDC initiatives to promote metadata. Moore County does not always create FGDC compliant metadata but maintains an internal document with basic descriptions of the layers and how often the data are updated. In fact, the document is on the website and available to users that download Moore County data.

Julie Stamper, Pasquotank County, Jerry Simmons, Pender County, and Alice Wilson, City of New Bern are not creating metadata.

Tom emphasized that the intention of this discussion is not to embarrass anyone but to identify the barriers or obstacles for creating metadata.

Chris said the main obstacle is competing with demands from management and elected officials. He mentioned redistricting, water quality modeling, sewer modeling and other applications and analysis as applications that take precedence. He serves many clients including the tax department, E-911, and utilities. With a small staff it is important that the staff are cross-trained to support these clients. Frankly, metadata cannot be a high priority. He would consider using an intern to work on metadata.

Jerry echoed Chris's observations. Pender County is a one-person shop and the obstacle is a time constraint issue. He acknowledged that lack of understanding of the tools and procedures for creating metadata may also be an obstacle.

Julie said that she is the primary user/maintainer of the parcel database and rarely gets requests for the data. Therefore metadata is not a high priority. Updating the metadata to indicate when the database was last updated is not a high priority.

Jerry said that those who request the data do not have many questions about the data other than when it was last updated. Chris asked Jerry if he did not get questions about the meaning of the attributes. He noted that Moore County created metadata or at least a document with basic descriptions because they received multiple requests to explain attributes, how frequently the dataset is updated, etc. This document has minimized questions.

Tom asked if management has concerns about the lack of metadata in the event that a GIS Coordinator retires or moves on. Jerry and Julie both noted that others on staff have some knowledge of the datasets. They also said that in the case of parcels, the tax department really maintains the tax records. The tax department does not maintain metadata. The GIS Coordinator may not even know the meaning of certain attributes in the tax records.

Alice asked about metadata training, which CGIA and others offered in the past. Can CGIA provide training? Jeff noted the value of integrating metadata development and maintenance into a workflow of managing GIS datasets. Recognizing the value of having metadata, for example to minimize phone calls with questions about the data, may be the driver for integrating the process into the work flow. He said that with the new standard, there may be new tools and techniques and more automated ways to manage metadata. Jeff noted that the new water and sewer standard and best practices documents include a template for metadata. James said that an updated html metadata template is part of the standard and practices. He opined that metadata is not hard to create but acknowledged that finding time for maintenance is difficult.

Alex said that for core datasets such as parcels and street centerlines, the need to update the metadata for new attributes is unusual. James agreed and said that Richmond County has metadata on most of the production layers in the SDE and these do not often change. He does not create metadata for temporary or pre-production files. Neither does Alex nor would Alex encourage metadata creation for this type of data. The value of metadata comes when you share the data.

James said that some people asking for a data layer don't even know what metadata is. Gene noted that some users don't need metadata. They may just want to display parcels on a Bing map.

Jeff acknowledged that metadata is important for publication data or any data that will be shared, but perhaps not for project data. Certainly the producer may not need to polish it.

Chris agreed that metadata maintenance needs to be included in the database maintenance process, especially for data layers that are available on the web site or being used by clients. GIS users need to develop the skill set for creating and maintaining metadata. He appreciated that in the past CGIA helped create metadata for datasets that Moore County served to NC OneMap. He suggested training sessions.

Chris acknowledged that identifying the motivation or benefit is the key. One benefit is easier customer service. County staff do not have to respond to as many questions. What are the other motivations that would drive producers to incorporate metadata in their regular data maintenance?

Tom asked if the Ramona GIS Inventory is an option for creating metadata. Jeff noted that by inventorying datasets in Ramona, a starter metadata record is automatically created although it is not FGDC compliant. Tom said that CGIA is considering options for an inventory of GIS data by North Carolina users and trying to assess whether Ramona is an appropriate tool for that – or not. The starter metadata record may be suitable for key word searches in the Geospatial Portal but Jeff will have to determine if this is true.

If a simpler metadata tool or process exists that does not create a complete FGDC compliant metadata record, would that address the motivation issue. Chris noted that at one point DOT used this approach – a simple, one sheet record of information that DOT needs. The documentation that Moore County uses fits this model and basically supports the needs of staff and internal users. Maybe this is all most agencies need. However, he said he is still a proponent of a common standard that everyone uses, in North Carolina and across the nation. When exchanging data during a disaster, metadata can be important to users unfamiliar with a local government agency's data, especially in situations where they cannot communicate easily or quickly with the data producer.

Chris believes that the importance of metadata is established. But a one-person county shop faces different challenges than a county with more staff and more resources. The question is how to find resources or training opportunities to encourage metadata creation

Tom asked if the current tools for creating make it difficult or time consuming to create metadata. Gene said that it can be time consuming. Gene says that one problem is that the GIS Coordinator may not know much about the attributes for a geospatial dataset. Staff have to spend time tracking down the necessary information. Still, Gene believes that the time invested in creating compliant metadata is worth it in the long run. He and his staff expend essentially no time responding to questions about their datasets because he can refer the user to the metadata online.

Alex asked if the question is about the interface in ArcGIS for editing metadata. Tom said yes, is it so complicated that it is a barrier? Alex said the interface is terrible, horrible. He said that the FGDC metadata handbook includes the seven categories and all the tabs. Free programs developed by USGS and others follow this design exactly. Unfortunately, the ArcCatalog tabs do not correspond directly or easily to the metadata standard. ArcCatalog is not intuitive. Despite this, Alex said he still only uses ArcCatalog. The reason is that otherwise he would have to train his staff to use a separate program or a text editor – one that they may only use once every few months. Students coming out of school are trained in ArcGIS and resist learning a new tool for a task that requires quarterly updates at best. ArcCatalog is part of the existing work flow. Alex suggests lobbying Esri to improve the ArcCatalog editor to more closely follow the FGDC standard rather than creating a new program.

Julie agreed that if a tool is outside of the Esri software, people are unlikely to use it. Jeff believes that Esri is moving toward the new ISO standard, which may improve the process. Jeff also noted that CGIA has a number of templates that help simplify the process.

Tom thanked the members for a very useful discussion that will help inform CGIA's thinking about metadata.

## LGC ACTION LIST

Tom said the first "LGC at Work" feature was submitted to NCPMA, which plans to include it in their December newsletter. He thanked Julie and Kevin Locklear, NCPMA newsletter editor, for their help. Tom also sent a version to Gene and James for the next CURISA newsletter. James said he hoped to generate the next CURISA newsletter after the first of the year. Tom suggested that he and James review the current version of "LGC at Work" to ensure that the information is still current when he is ready to publish the newsletter.

Tom said he has not initiated efforts to work with the League of Municipalities and the Association of County Commissioners to include this feature in their newsletters but plans to do so.

The other item that was open is the issue of developing guidelines for reviewing and endorsing grant proposals and the LGC reps to the SMAC raised the issue at the last SMAC meeting.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Julie said there continues to be mention of Next Gen 911. She said that she doesn't really know very much about Next Gen 911 and asked if the LGC could invite someone to explain it at the next LGC meeting. Everyone endorsed this idea.

**Action Item** – Tom will explore opportunities for inviting someone to brief the LGC on Next Gen 911.

#### NEXT MEETING

The next LGC meeting will be after the February 8 GICC meeting, date to be determined.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.