

Illinois State Geological Survey

The Illinois State Geological Survey (ISGS) was designed to measure public and non-profit organizations about the use, importance, and issues related to GIS in Illinois. The study was sponsored by a USGS grant through Don Luman, Ph.D. Illinois State Geological Survey.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed with input from a select group of Illinois GIS users. It was administered online from the Public Opinion Laboratory at Northern Illinois University. Email invitations to participate were sent to respondents a maximum of three times. Once the respondent had completed the survey or indicated at the first page of the questionnaire they were not interested in participating, they were no longer contacted regarding the survey.

Sample

The initial list of email addresses contained 1435 respondents. Respondents were chosen from various levels of government (community, county, regional, state, and federal level positions within Illinois) and non-profit sectors where GIS would be useful.

Data Collection

The initial email message was sent December 10-12, 2007. The first reminder email message was sent January 8th, 2008 and the second reminder was sent January 12th, 2008. One additional email was sent to non-respondents directly from Don Luman on January 22nd, 2008 asking respondents to complete their questionnaires.

From the initial email mailing, 93 messages (6.5%) were returned as undeliverable. For all undeliverable email addresses, a letter with a link, ID, and password were sent to ensure that the respondent had an opportunity to participate. Of those 96 respondents, ten completed the survey by manually typing in their link, ID, and password,

A total of 749 respondents either completed a majority of the survey (699) or indicated that they were not interested in participating in the survey (50). Some of those who indicated that they were not interested stated that they did not feel familiar enough or did not use GIS in their work. There were four respondents added to the sample because they were identified as a more appropriate person to contact for an organization. Thus the total sample was 1439 with 50 respondents indicating they were not the appropriate contact person. The overall response rate is 52% including those not interested.

This data codebook summary information for the survey conducted during December 2007 and January 2008. The study data contain information collected from 699 completed questionnaires. Fifty respondents indicated by their response to the first page of the questionnaire that they did not want to participate.

The structure of the codebook mirrors the format of the survey with the questions presented in the same order as they were asked online. Summary information for each question includes a response frequency table that summarizes the count, *raw percentage*, and *valid percentage* of respondents who answered the question in a certain way.

For each page presented to the respondent, the codebook includes the text of the question, and the table of response frequencies.

SOME HELPFUL TERMS WHEN TALKING ABOUT SURVEY DATA

Valid cases are those in which respondents answered the question.

Non-valid or "**missing**" cases are cases in which questions were skipped (because they were not applicable to the respondent *or* the respondent refused to answer the question *or* didn't have a response).

The **raw percent** is the percentage of all cases in the sample (all cases that completed the questionnaire) that responded to a question in a certain way. The number of missing cases is included in the calculation of the raw percent.

The **valid percent** is the percentage of valid cases that responded to the question in a certain way. Missing cases are excluded from the calculation of the valid percent.

The **cumulative percent** is the cumulative percentage of valid cases that responded to the question in a certain way. Missing cases are excluded from the calculation of the cumulative percent.

Table of Contents

Online Survey Illinois State Geological Survey	1
Online Survey Page: Welcome	5
CHOOSE	5
Online Survey Page: ISGS11	6
ISGS11	6
Online Survey Page: ISGS12	7
ISGS12	7
Online Survey Page: ISGS13	8
ISGS13	8
Online Survey Page: ISGS14	9
ISGS14_1	9
CONNECT	10
Online Survey Page: ISGS15	10
USERA	10
USERB	11
Online Survey Page: ISGS20	12
ISGS20_1	12
ISGS20_2	13
Online Survey Page: ISGS21	14
ISGS21	14
Online Survey Page: ISGS22	15
ISGS22_1	15
ISGS22_2	15
Online Survey Page: ISGS23	16
ISGS23_1	16
ISGS23_2	16
Online Survey Page: ISGS24	17
ISGS24_1	17
ISGS24_2	18
COSTS	18
ISGS24_4	19
ISGS24_5	19
Online Survey Page: ISGS24a	20
ISGS24a	20
Online Survey Page: ISGS25	21
ISGS25 Summary	21
ISGS25_1 FIRST most useful type	22
ISGS25_2 SECOND most useful type	22
ISGS25_3 THIRD most useful type	23
ISGS25_4 FOURTH most useful type	23
ISGS25_5 FIFTH most useful type	24
Online Survey Page: ISGS26	25
ISGS26	25
Online Survey Page: ISGS27	27
ISGS27_1	27
ISGS27_2 Summary	28
ISGS27_2 Summary	28
ISGS27_2_1 First priority	29

ISGS27_2_2 Second priority.....	29
ISGS27_2_3 Third priority.....	29
ISGS27_2_4 Fourth priority	30
ISGS27_2_5 Fifth priority.....	30
ISGS27_2_6 Sixth priority.....	30
ISGS27_2_7 Seventh priority.....	31
ISGS27_2_8 Eighth priority.....	31
Online Survey Page: ISGS28	32
ISGS28	32
Online Survey Page: ISGS281	32
ISGS281	32
Online Survey Page: ISGS282	33
ISGS282	33
Online Survey Page: ISGS29	33
ISGS29	33
Online Survey Page: ISGS30	34
ISGS30_1	34
ISGS30_2	34
Online Survey Page: ISGS31	35
ISGS31 Summary	35
ISGS31_1	36
ISGS31_2	36
ISGS31_3	37
ISGS31_4	37
ISGS31_5	38
Online Survey Page: ISGS32	39
ISGS32	39
Online Survey Page: ISGS40	40
ISGS40 Summary	40
ISGS40_1	40
ISGS40_2	41
ISGS40_3	41
ISGS40_4	41
Online Survey Page: ISGS41	42
ISGS41_1	42
ISGS41_2	42
Online Survey Page: NI	43
NI_1	43

Online Survey Page: Welcome

This survey is designed for both users and non-users of GIS. The purpose of the survey is to acquire a better understanding of the current status and perspectives of GIS across the entire state, and the information gathered should be useful to everybody interested in governmental use of GIS in Illinois.

Please select one item and click next.

Yes, I would like to participate

No, I choose not to participate

CHOOSE		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, I would like to participate	699	93.3	93.3	93.3
	No, I choose not to participate	50	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	749	100.0	100.0	

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is a system of hardware and software designed for the capture, storage, retrieval, analysis and display of geographically referenced data to support inquiry and decision-making in research, planning and management of natural resources, demographic data, transportation, infrastructure, and other geospatial information.

Online Survey Page: ISGS11

Please select one from the following that best describes your organization.

- College / University
- County
- Federal
- Municipality, 0-15,000
- Municipality 15,000-30,000
- Municipality, 30,000-60,000
- Municipality, over 60,000
- Non-Profit Organization
- Regional Planning Commission / Council
- State
- Other, please specify

ISGS11		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	County	175	23.4	25.1	25.1
	College / University	87	11.6	12.5	37.6
	Municipality, 0-15,000	77	10.3	11.0	48.6
	Municipality 15,000-30,000	77	10.3	11.0	59.7
	Municipality, 30,000-60,000	76	10.1	10.9	70.6
	State	75	10.0	10.8	81.3
	Municipality, over 60,000	54	7.2	7.7	89.1
	Regional Planning Commission / Council	25	3.3	3.6	92.7
	Federal	21	2.8	3.0	95.7
	Other, please specify	20	2.7	2.9	98.6
	Non-Profit Organization	10	1.3	1.4	100.0
	Total	697	93.1	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	2	.3		
	Total	52	6.9		
Total	749	100.0			

Online Survey Page: ISGS12

Please select one from the following that best fits your job position.

- Agency Director / Executive Director
- City Manager
- College / University faculty
- College / University other than faculty
- County Administrator
- Department Head / Assistant Department Head
- Elected Official
- GIS Manager
- Supervisor
- Staff, GIS user
- Staff, non-GIS user
- Other, please specify

ISGS12		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Staff, GIS user	145	19.4	20.9	20.9
	GIS Manager	133	17.8	19.2	40.1
	Department Head / Assistant Department Head	132	17.6	19.0	59.1
	City Manager	57	7.6	8.2	67.3
	Other, please specify	45	6.0	6.5	73.8
	College / University other than faculty	40	5.3	5.8	79.5
	Supervisor	33	4.4	4.8	84.3
	Elected Official	32	4.3	4.6	88.9
	College / University faculty	26	3.5	3.7	92.7
	Staff, non-GIS user	26	3.5	3.7	96.4
	Agency Director / Executive Director	16	2.1	2.3	98.7
	County Administrator	9	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	694	92.7	100.0	
	Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7	
Not asked/No response		5	.7		
Total		55	7.3		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS13

What function or functions best describe your job responsibility?

Please check all that apply.

- Academic / Educational
- Economic Development
- Government
- Health
- Homeland Security
- Natural Resource Management
- Planning
- Public Safety
- Regulatory
- Tax Assessment
- Transportation
- Other, please specify

ISGS13	Selected	
	Count	%
Academic / Educational	104	14.9%
Economic Development	94	13.4%
Government	421	60.2%
Health	23	3.3%
Homeland Security	34	4.9%
Natural Resource Management	71	10.2%
Planning	174	24.9%
Public Safety	80	11.4%
Regulatory	33	4.7%
Tax Assessment	95	13.6%
Transportation	94	13.4%
Other, please specify	83	11.9%

Online Survey Page: ISGS14

During an average week, how many hours do you use a computer for work related responsibilities?

- Less than 1 hour per week
- 1 to 2 hours
- 3 to 5 hours
- 6 to 10 hours
- 11 to 20 hours
- 21 to 30 hours
- Over 30 hours per week

<i>ISGS14_1</i>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 2 hours	1	.1	.1	.1
	3 to 5 hours	11	1.5	1.6	1.7
	6 to 10 hours	42	5.6	6.1	7.8
	11 to 20 hours	101	13.5	14.6	22.4
	21 to 30 hours	173	23.1	25.0	47.4
	Over 30 hours per week	364	48.6	52.6	100.0
	Total	692	92.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	7	.9		
	Total	57	7.6		
Total		749	100.0		

What type of Internet access is available in your department or organization?

High Speed (Cable, DSL, Wireless, etc.)

Leased Line (T1, T3, Frame Relay, etc.)

Dial-up

None

Don't know

Other, please describe

CONNECT		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High Speed (Cable, DSL, Wireless, etc.)	400	53.4	58.4	58.4
	Leased Line (T1, T3, Frame Relay, etc.)	263	35.1	38.4	96.8
	Dial-up	1	.1	.1	96.9
	Don't know	14	1.9	2.0	99.0
	Other, please describe	7	.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	685	91.5	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	14	1.9		
	Total	64	8.5		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS15

Do you personally use GIS in your work?

Yes, frequently

Yes, occasionally

No, but it would be useful to my work

No

USERA		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, frequently	359	47.9	52.0	52.0
	Yes, occasionally	154	20.6	22.3	74.2
	No, but it would be useful to my work	82	10.9	11.9	86.1
	No	96	12.8	13.9	100.0
	Total	691	92.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	8	1.1		
	Total	58	7.7		
Total		749	100.0		

How long has your department or organization been using GIS?

- Less than one year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years
- Not currently, but plan to implement GIS within the next year
- Not currently, but plan to implement GIS sometime beyond the next year
- Not using GIS
- Don't know

USERB		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than one year	21	2.8	3.1	3.1
	1-2 years	79	10.5	11.5	14.6
	3-5 years	148	19.8	21.5	36.1
	6-10 years	147	19.6	21.4	57.5
	More than 10 years	155	20.7	22.6	80.1
	Not currently, but plan to implement GIS within the next year	29	3.9	4.2	84.3
	Not currently, but plan to implement GIS sometime beyond the next year	18	2.4	2.6	86.9
	Not using GIS	61	8.1	8.9	95.8
	Don't know	29	3.9	4.2	100.0
	Total	687	91.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	12	1.6		
	Total	62	8.3		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS20

How long have you personally been using GIS in your work?

- 1 year or less
- 2-3 years
- 4-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years

<i>ISGS20_1</i>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year or less	69	9.2	12.6	12.6
	2-3 years	114	15.2	20.8	33.4
	4-5 years	91	12.1	16.6	50.0
	6-10 years	134	17.9	24.5	74.5
	More than 10 years	140	18.7	25.5	100.0
	Total	548	73.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	151	20.2		
	Total	201	26.8		
Total		749	100.0		

Select the general category that best describes your department's use of GIS.

Planning stage

Early development stage

Some limited production use is taking place.

Department is actively creating and maintaining major data resources.

Department has developed all major needed data resources and maintains them.

Consultants are developing GIS data; department has no plans for in-house GIS.

Consultants are developing GIS data; department plans to have GIS in-house.

Don't know

ISGS20_2		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Planning stage	16	2.1	2.9	2.9
	Early development stage	39	5.2	7.0	9.9
	Some limited production use is taking place.	81	10.8	14.5	24.4
	Department is actively creating and maintaining major data resources.	254	33.9	45.6	70.0
	Department has developed all major needed data resources and maintains them.	110	14.7	19.7	89.8
	Consultants are developing GIS data; department has no plans for in-house GIS.	8	1.1	1.4	91.2
	Consultants are developing GIS data; department plans to have GIS in-house.	26	3.5	4.7	95.9
	Don't know	23	3.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	557	74.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	142	19.0		
	Total	192	25.6		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS21

For what broad applications is GIS being used or planned in your department?

Please check all that apply.

- Community Development
- Economic Development
- Emergency Dispatch
- Emergency Management
- Environment
- Health
- Land Cover
- Land Use
- Law Enforcement
- Permit Review
- Planning
- Tax Assessment
- Transportation
- Vehicle Tracking
- Zoning
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS21</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Community Development	312	54.3%
Economic Development	268	46.6%
Emergency Dispatch	159	27.7%
Emergency Management	208	36.2%
Environment	214	37.2%
Health	110	19.1%
Land Cover	175	30.4%
Land Use	385	67.0%
Law Enforcement	175	30.4%
Permit Review	180	31.3%
Planning	351	61.0%
Tax Assessment	165	28.7%
Transportation	229	39.8%
Vehicle Tracking	53	9.2%
Zoning	296	51.5%
Other	112	19.5%

Online Survey Page: ISGS22

Does your department employ GIS staff?

Please check all that apply.

- One or more full-time GIS positions
- One or more part-time GIS positions
- One or more GIS interns
- Regular staff has learned to use GIS software
- Department uses consultant to develop GIS products
- No GIS staff
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS22_1</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Staff - One or more full-time GIS positions	319	55.5%
Staff - One or more part-time GIS positions	52	9.0%
Staff - One or more GIS interns	69	12.0%
Staff - Regular staff has learned to use GIS software	184	32.0%
Staff - Department uses consultant to develop GIS products	80	13.9%
Staff - No GIS staff	90	15.7%
Staff - Other, please describe	21	3.7%

Where does your department obtain GIS data?

Please check all that apply.

- All from external government agencies
- Some from external government agencies
- All purchased or licensed from external commercial sources
- Some purchased or licensed from external commercial sources
- Some created in-house
- Majority created in-house
- Develop or acquire GIS data through partnerships with other agencies
- Don't know

<i>ISGS22_2</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Source of GIS data: All from external government agencies	44	7.7%
Source of GIS data: Some from external government agencies	329	57.2%
Source of GIS data: All purchased or licensed from external commercial sources	22	3.8%
Source of GIS data: Some purchased or licensed from external commercial sources	180	31.3%
Source of GIS data: Some created in-house	232	40.3%
Source of GIS data: Majority created in-house	225	39.1%
Source of GIS data: Develop or acquire GIS data through partnerships with other agencies	272	47.3%
Source of GIS data: Don't know	29	5.0%

Online Survey Page: ISGS23

Is access to any of your department's GIS data subject to restrictions?

Please check all that apply.

- Law enforcement data
- Health data
- Data purchased or licensed from government agencies
- Data purchased or licensed from commercial sources
- Military data
- No restrictions
- Other, please describe

ISGS23_1	Selected	
	Count	%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Law enforcement data	123	21.4%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Health data	64	11.1%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Data purchased or licensed from government agencies	172	29.9%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Data purchased or licensed from commercial sources	104	18.1%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Military data	7	1.2%
GIS data subject to restrictions: No restrictions	172	29.9%
GIS data subject to restrictions: Other, please describe	96	16.7%

What is your primary GIS software for data creation and maintenance?

- AutoCAD
- Bentley Microstation
- Erdas Imagine
- ESRI ArcGIS
- Intergraph
- Don't know
- Other, please describe

ISGS23_2		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	AutoCAD	9	1.2	1.6	1.6
	Erdas Imagine	1	.1	.2	1.8
	ESRI ArcGIS	468	62.5	85.2	87.1
	Intergraph	10	1.3	1.8	88.9
	Don't know	44	5.9	8.0	96.9
	Other, please describe	17	2.3	3.1	100.0
	Total	549	73.3	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	150	20.0		
	Total	200	26.7		
Total		749	100.0		

Are you using a standard for compiling documentation (metadata) about your GIS data?

Yes, Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) standard

Yes, internal agency standard

Yes, library standard (MARC, Dublin CORE)

Yes, other, please describe below

No

Don't know

ISGS23_3		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) standard	169	22.6	31.1	31.1
	Yes, internal agency standard	47	6.3	8.6	39.7
	Yes, library standard (MARC, Dublin CORE)	3	.4	.6	40.3
	Yes, other, please describe below	8	1.1	1.5	41.7
	No	147	19.6	27.0	68.8
	Don't know	170	22.7	31.3	100.0
Total		544	72.6	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	155	20.7		
	Total	205	27.4		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS24

Does your department participate in larger GIS program within your organization or agency?

Yes

No

Not sure

ISGS24_1		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	319	42.6	58.9	58.9
	No	184	24.6	33.9	92.8
	Not sure	39	5.2	7.2	100.0
	Total	542	72.4	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	157	21.0		
	Total	207	27.6		
Total		749	100.0		

Does your department provide GIS data to other organizations?
Please check all that apply.

- Yes, some government agencies
- Yes, some non-profit agencies / organizations
- Yes, some regulated private sector companies
- Yes, data that is regarded as public domain
- Yes, data are presented on the web for public access
- No, department's GIS data is only used internally

ISGS24_2	Selected	
	Count	%
Yes, some government agencies	361	62.8%
Yes, some non-profit agencies / organizations	208	36.2%
Yes, some regulated private sector companies	154	26.8%
Yes, data that is regarded as public domain	191	33.2%
Yes, data are presented on the web for public access	175	30.4%
No, department's GIS data is only used internally	111	19.3%

Does your department charge a fee to provide or to access your GIS data?

- Yes
- Sometimes, depending on circumstances or on case-by-case basis
- No

COSTS		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	70	9.3	13.3	13.3
	Sometimes, depending on circumstances or on case-by-case basis	180	24.0	34.3	47.6
	No	275	36.7	52.4	100.0
	Total	525	70.1	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	174	23.2		
	Total	224	29.9		
Total		749	100.0		

Concerning Illinois statutes about access and costs issues, please respond to the following comments by selecting one of the five categories.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

ISGS24_4 Illinois statutes governing public access to GIS data are clear and easy to understand.

ISGS24_5 Illinois statutes governing costs for GIS data are clear and easy to understand.

	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %
ISGS24_4	1.9%	9.0%	59.4%	20.1%	9.6%
ISGS24_5	1.5%	7.1%	60.2%	21.5%	9.8%

ISGS24_4		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	10	1.3	1.9	1.9
	Agree	47	6.3	9.0	10.9
	Undecided	310	41.4	59.4	70.3
	Disagree	105	14.0	20.1	90.4
	Strongly disagree	50	6.7	9.6	100.0
	Total	522	69.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	177	23.6		
	Total	227	30.3		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS24_5		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	8	1.1	1.5	1.5
	Agree	37	4.9	7.1	8.6
	Undecided	314	41.9	60.2	68.8
	Disagree	112	15.0	21.5	90.2
	Strongly disagree	51	6.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	522	69.7	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	177	23.6		
	Total	227	30.3		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS24a

How does your department charge a fee to provide or to access your GIS data?

Please check all that apply.

We sell some data at the cost of reproduction.

We license use of some of our data and charge a fee that helps recover the cost of creating and maintaining it.

We sell copies of our data at a price that helps recover the cost of creating and maintaining it.

We provide some data at no charge to other government agencies.

We provide some data at no charge to other organizations in exchange for receiving data from them.

Other, please describe

ISGS24a	Selected	
	Count	%
We sell some data at the cost of reproduction.	117	38.6%
We license use of some of our data and charge a fee that helps recover the cost of creating and maintaining it.	61	20.1%
We sell copies of our data at a price that helps recover the cost of creating and maintaining it.	111	36.6%
We provide some data at no charge to other government agencies.	177	58.4%
We provide some data at no charge to other organizations in exchange for receiving data from them.	120	39.6%
Other, please describe	24	7.9%

Online Survey Page: ISGS25

Please prioritize the top five useful types of geospatial information GIS could provide to your department or organization, with '1' being the most useful.

- Aerial photography/digital orthophotography
- Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.
- Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.
- Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.
- Land Cover
- Land Use
- Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.
- Railroads
- Roads
- Soils
- Structures
- Tax Parcels
- Water
- Wetlands
- Zoning
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS25 Summary</i>	FIRST most useful type		SECOND most useful		THIRD most useful		FOURTH most useful		FIFTH most useful type	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	224	42.6%	89	17.1%	64	12.5%	45	9.0%	38	7.8%
Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	21	4.0%	64	12.3%	47	9.2%	32	6.4%	42	8.7%
Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	9	1.7%	2	.4%	8	1.6%	9	1.8%	4	.8%
Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	35	6.7%	58	11.1%	61	12.0%	59	11.8%	59	12.2%
Land Cover	8	1.5%	11	2.1%	18	3.5%	15	3.0%	11	2.3%
Land Use	25	4.8%	40	7.7%	58	11.4%	43	8.6%	47	9.7%
Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	4	.8%	14	2.7%	7	1.4%	15	3.0%	16	3.3%
Railroads	0	.0%	4	.8%	12	2.4%	8	1.6%	14	2.9%
Roads	38	7.2%	73	14.0%	76	14.9%	60	12.0%	59	12.2%
Soils	3	.6%	14	2.7%	24	4.7%	19	3.8%	31	6.4%
Structures	7	1.3%	16	3.1%	23	4.5%	44	8.8%	38	7.8%
Tax Parcels	114	21.7%	80	15.4%	51	10.0%	52	10.4%	30	6.2%
Water	6	1.1%	9	1.7%	12	2.4%	31	6.2%	26	5.4%
Wetlands	2	.4%	3	.6%	13	2.5%	18	3.6%	20	4.1%
Zoning	11	2.1%	33	6.3%	32	6.3%	41	8.2%	42	8.7%
Other, please describe	19	3.6%	11	2.1%	4	.8%	9	1.8%	8	1.6%

ISGS25_1 FIRST most useful type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	224	29.9	42.6	42.6
	Tax Parcels	114	15.2	21.7	64.3
	Roads	38	5.1	7.2	71.5
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	35	4.7	6.7	78.1
	Land Use	25	3.3	4.8	82.9
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	21	2.8	4.0	86.9
	Other, please describe	19	2.5	3.6	90.5
	Zoning	11	1.5	2.1	92.6
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	9	1.2	1.7	94.3
	Land Cover	8	1.1	1.5	95.8
	Structures	7	.9	1.3	97.1
	Water	6	.8	1.1	98.3
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	4	.5	.8	99.0
	Soils	3	.4	.6	99.6
	Wetlands	2	.3	.4	100.0
Total	526	70.2	100.0		
Missing	Not asked/No response	173	23.1		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	223	29.8		
Total	749	100.0			

ISGS25_2 SECOND most useful type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	89	11.9	17.1	17.1
	Tax Parcels	80	10.7	15.4	32.4
	Roads	73	9.7	14.0	46.4
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	64	8.5	12.3	58.7
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	58	7.7	11.1	69.9
	Land Use	40	5.3	7.7	77.5
	Zoning	33	4.4	6.3	83.9
	Structures	16	2.1	3.1	86.9
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	14	1.9	2.7	89.6
	Soils	14	1.9	2.7	92.3
	Land Cover	11	1.5	2.1	94.4
	Other, please describe	11	1.5	2.1	96.5
	Water	9	1.2	1.7	98.3
	Railroads	4	.5	.8	99.0
	Wetlands	3	.4	.6	99.6
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	2	.3	.4	100.0
	Total	521	69.6	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	178	23.8		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	228	30.4		
Total	749	100.0			

ISGS25_3 THIRD most useful type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Roads	76	10.1	14.9	14.9
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	64	8.5	12.5	27.5
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	61	8.1	12.0	39.4
	Land Use	58	7.7	11.4	50.8
	Tax Parcels	51	6.8	10.0	60.8
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	47	6.3	9.2	70.0
	Zoning	32	4.3	6.3	76.3
	Soils	24	3.2	4.7	81.0
	Structures	23	3.1	4.5	85.5
	Land Cover	18	2.4	3.5	89.0
	Wetlands	13	1.7	2.5	91.6
	Railroads	12	1.6	2.4	93.9
	Water	12	1.6	2.4	96.3
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	8	1.1	1.6	97.8
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	7	.9	1.4	99.2
Other, please describe	4	.5	.8	100.0	
Total	510	68.1	100.0		
Missing	Not asked/No response	189	25.2		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	239	31.9		
Total	749	100.0			

ISGS25_4 FOURTH most useful type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Roads	60	8.0	12.0	12.0
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	59	7.9	11.8	23.8
	Tax Parcels	52	6.9	10.4	34.2
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	45	6.0	9.0	43.2
	Structures	44	5.9	8.8	52.0
	Land Use	43	5.7	8.6	60.6
	Zoning	41	5.5	8.2	68.8
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	32	4.3	6.4	75.2
	Water	31	4.1	6.2	81.4
	Soils	19	2.5	3.8	85.2
	Wetlands	18	2.4	3.6	88.8
	Land Cover	15	2.0	3.0	91.8
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	15	2.0	3.0	94.8
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	9	1.2	1.8	96.6
	Other, please describe	9	1.2	1.8	98.4
Railroads	8	1.1	1.6	100.0	
Total	500	66.8	100.0		
Missing	Not asked/No response	199	26.6		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	249	33.2		
Total	749	100.0			

ISGS25_5 FIFTH most useful type		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	59	7.9	12.2	12.2
	Roads	59	7.9	12.2	24.3
	Land Use	47	6.3	9.7	34.0
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	42	5.6	8.7	42.7
	Zoning	42	5.6	8.7	51.3
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	38	5.1	7.8	59.2
	Structures	38	5.1	7.8	67.0
	Soils	31	4.1	6.4	73.4
	Tax Parcels	30	4.0	6.2	79.6
	Water	26	3.5	5.4	84.9
	Wetlands	20	2.7	4.1	89.1
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	16	2.1	3.3	92.4
	Railroads	14	1.9	2.9	95.3
	Land Cover	11	1.5	2.3	97.5
	Other, please describe	8	1.1	1.6	99.2
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	4	.5	.8	100.0
	Total	485	64.8	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	214	28.6		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	264	35.2		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS26

Where do you personally obtain information about GIS?

Please check all that apply.

Illinois GIS Association conferences, workshops, and newsletters

Other professional associations

Vendor-based classes and conferences

Specialty GIS conferences

College / University classes or workshops

Magazines or newsletters

Internet websites

Blogs

Podcasts

Colleagues

Other, please describe

ISGS26	Selected	
	Count	%
Illinois GIS Association conferences, workshops, and newsletters	333	57.9%
Other professional associations	211	36.7%
Vendor-based classes and conferences	234	40.7%
Specialty GIS conferences	145	25.2%
College / University classes or workshops	122	21.2%
Magazines or newsletters	281	48.9%
Internet websites	312	54.3%
Blogs	60	10.4%
Podcasts	39	6.8%
Colleagues	308	53.6%
Other source	30	5.2%

Are you personally aware of the Illinois GIS Clearinghouse, an Internet site providing access to geospatial data?

Yes, have downloaded data and find the information useful

Yes, have downloaded data, but found the information not of particular value

Yes, have visited the website, but have not downloaded any data

Yes, but never utilized the website

No, I'm not aware of the Illinois GIS Clearinghouse

IGISC		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, have downloaded data and find the information useful	201	26.8	37.8	37.8
	Yes, have downloaded data, but found the information not of particular value	33	4.4	6.2	44.0
	Yes, have visited the website, but have not downloaded any data	64	8.5	12.0	56.0
	Yes, but never utilized the website	61	8.1	11.5	67.5
	No, I'm not aware of the Illinois GIS Clearinghouse	173	23.1	32.5	100.0
	Total	532	71.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	167	22.3		
	Total	217	29.0		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS27

Select the statement below that best describes your involvement regarding ILGISA, the Illinois Geographic Information Systems Association.

- Not familiar with ILGISA
- Aware of ILGISA, but don't know anything about it
- Not a current member, but have attended at least one ILGISA conference
- Current member; attended at least one ILGISA conference
- Current member; have not attended an ILGISA conference

<i>ISGS27_1</i>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not familiar with ILGISA	99	13.2	18.6	18.6
	Aware of ILGISA, but don't know anything about it	70	9.3	13.2	31.8
	Not a current member, but have attended at least one ILGISA conference	56	7.5	10.5	42.3
	Current member; attended at least one ILGISA conference	285	38.1	53.6	95.9
	Current member; have not attended an ILGISA conference	22	2.9	4.1	100.0
	Total	532	71.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	167	22.3		
	Total	217	29.0		
Total		749	100.0		

Please prioritize the following broad issues as they affect GIS in Illinois from '1' through '8', with '1' being the highest priority.

- Communication among organizations
- Coordination
- Data resources and availability
- Data sharing and distribution
- Education and training
- Funding
- Legislative support
- Standards

<i>ISGS27_2 Summary</i>	First		Second		Third.		Fourth.		Fifth		Sixth.		Seventh		Eighth.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Communication among organizations	58	11.5%	47	9.4%	67	13.5%	83	16.9%	79	16.3%	67	14.3%	47	10.1%	34	7.5%
Coordination	48	9.5%	49	9.8%	70	14.1%	88	18.0%	75	15.4%	69	14.7%	53	11.3%	30	6.6%
Data resources and availability	81	16.1%	83	16.7%	67	13.5%	65	13.3%	68	14.0%	48	10.2%	49	10.5%	26	5.7%
Data sharing and distribution	82	16.3%	113	22.7%	84	16.9%	55	11.2%	50	10.3%	50	10.7%	37	7.9%	23	5.1%
Education and training	49	9.7%	47	9.4%	59	11.9%	63	12.9%	62	12.8%	70	14.9%	61	13.1%	73	16.1%
Funding	109	21.7%	68	13.7%	58	11.7%	46	9.4%	44	9.1%	70	14.9%	67	14.3%	25	5.5%
Legislative support	33	6.6%	42	8.4%	36	7.2%	41	8.4%	48	9.9%	42	9.0%	76	16.3%	152	33.6%
Standards	43	8.5%	49	9.8%	56	11.3%	49	10.0%	60	12.3%	53	11.3%	77	16.5%	90	19.9%

<i>ISGS27_2 Summary</i>		Communication among organizations	Coordination	Data resources and availability	Data sharing and distribution	Education and training	Funding	Legislative support	Standards
		First	N 58 % 11.5%	48 9.5%	81 16.1%	82 16.3%	49 9.7%	109 21.7%	33 6.6%
Second	N 47 % 9.4%	49 9.8%	83 16.7%	113 22.7%	47 9.4%	68 13.7%	42 8.4%	49 9.8%	
Third.	N 67 % 13.5%	70 14.1%	67 13.5%	84 16.9%	59 11.9%	58 11.7%	36 7.2%	56 11.3%	
Fourth.	N 83 % 16.9%	88 18.0%	65 13.3%	55 11.2%	63 12.9%	46 9.4%	41 8.4%	49 10.0%	
Fifth	N 79 % 16.3%	75 15.4%	68 14.0%	50 10.3%	62 12.8%	44 9.1%	48 9.9%	60 12.3%	
Sixth.	N 67 % 14.3%	69 14.7%	48 10.2%	50 10.7%	70 14.9%	70 14.9%	42 9.0%	53 11.3%	
Seventh	N 47 % 10.1%	53 11.3%	49 10.5%	37 7.9%	61 13.1%	67 14.3%	76 16.3%	77 16.5%	
Eighth.	N 34 % 7.5%	30 6.6%	26 5.7%	23 5.1%	73 16.1%	25 5.5%	152 33.6%	90 19.9%	

ISGS27_2_1 First priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Funding	109	14.6	21.7	21.7
	Data sharing and distribution	82	10.9	16.3	38.0
	Data resources and availability	81	10.8	16.1	54.1
	Communication among organizations	58	7.7	11.5	65.6
	Education and training	49	6.5	9.7	75.3
	Coordination	48	6.4	9.5	84.9
	Standards	43	5.7	8.5	93.4
	Legislative support	33	4.4	6.6	100.0
	Total	503	67.2	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	196	26.2		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	246	32.8		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_2 Second priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data sharing and distribution	113	15.1	22.7	22.7
	Data resources and availability	83	11.1	16.7	39.4
	Funding	68	9.1	13.7	53.0
	Coordination	49	6.5	9.8	62.9
	Standards	49	6.5	9.8	72.7
	Communication among organizations	47	6.3	9.4	82.1
	Education and training	47	6.3	9.4	91.6
	Legislative support	42	5.6	8.4	100.0
	Total	498	66.5	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	201	26.8		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	251	33.5		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_3 Third priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Data sharing and distribution	84	11.2	16.9	16.9
	Coordination	70	9.3	14.1	31.0
	Communication among organizations	67	8.9	13.5	44.5
	Data resources and availability	67	8.9	13.5	57.9
	Education and training	59	7.9	11.9	69.8
	Funding	58	7.7	11.7	81.5
	Standards	56	7.5	11.3	92.8
	Legislative support	36	4.8	7.2	100.0
	Total	497	66.4	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	202	27.0		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	252	33.6		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_4 Fourth priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Coordination	88	11.7	18.0	18.0
	Communication among organizations	83	11.1	16.9	34.9
	Data resources and availability	65	8.7	13.3	48.2
	Education and training	63	8.4	12.9	61.0
	Data sharing and distribution	55	7.3	11.2	72.2
	Standards	49	6.5	10.0	82.2
	Funding	46	6.1	9.4	91.6
	Legislative support	41	5.5	8.4	100.0
	Total	490	65.4	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	209	27.9		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	259	34.6		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_5 Fifth priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Communication among organizations	79	10.5	16.3	16.3
	Coordination	75	10.0	15.4	31.7
	Data resources and availability	68	9.1	14.0	45.7
	Education and training	62	8.3	12.8	58.4
	Standards	60	8.0	12.3	70.8
	Data sharing and distribution	50	6.7	10.3	81.1
	Legislative support	48	6.4	9.9	90.9
	Funding	44	5.9	9.1	100.0
	Total	486	64.9	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	213	28.4		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	263	35.1		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_6 Sixth priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education and training	70	9.3	14.9	14.9
	Funding	70	9.3	14.9	29.9
	Coordination	69	9.2	14.7	44.6
	Communication among organizations	67	8.9	14.3	58.8
	Standards	53	7.1	11.3	70.1
	Data sharing and distribution	50	6.7	10.7	80.8
	Data resources and availability	48	6.4	10.2	91.0
	Legislative support	42	5.6	9.0	100.0
		Total	469	62.6	100.0
Missing	Not asked/No response	230	30.7		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	280	37.4		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_7 Seventh priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Standards	77	10.3	16.5	16.5
	Legislative support	76	10.1	16.3	32.8
	Funding	67	8.9	14.3	47.1
	Education and training	61	8.1	13.1	60.2
	Coordination	53	7.1	11.3	71.5
	Data resources and availability	49	6.5	10.5	82.0
	Communication among organizations	47	6.3	10.1	92.1
	Data sharing and distribution	37	4.9	7.9	100.0
	Total	467	62.3	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	232	31.0		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	282	37.7		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS27_2_8 Eighth priority		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Legislative support	152	20.3	33.6	33.6
	Standards	90	12.0	19.9	53.4
	Education and training	73	9.7	16.1	69.5
	Communication among organizations	34	4.5	7.5	77.0
	Coordination	30	4.0	6.6	83.7
	Data resources and availability	26	3.5	5.7	89.4
	Funding	25	3.3	5.5	94.9
	Data sharing and distribution	23	3.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	453	60.5	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	246	32.8		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	296	39.5		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS28

Within Illinois, who should assume the responsibility for developing GIS standards?
Please check all that apply.

Agencies having similar responsibilities should cooperatively develop common standards.

Department of Homeland Security standards should be used as applicable.

FGDC standards for metadata and other topics should be used as applicable.

Independent advisory board should establish mandatory standards for all governmental agencies.

Individual agency or organization that creates the GIS data.

State of Illinois should establish mandatory standards for all government agencies.

U.S. Postal Service addressing standards should be used.

Other, please describe

ISGS28	Selected	
	Count	%
Agencies having similar responsibilities should cooperatively develop common standards.	272	47.3%
Department of Homeland Security standards should be used as applicable.	67	11.7%
FGDC standards for metadata and other topics should be used as applicable.	207	36.0%
Independent advisory board should establish mandatory standards for all governmental agencies.	97	16.9%
Individual agency or organization that creates the GIS data.	110	19.1%
State of Illinois should establish mandatory standards for all government agencies.	146	25.4%
U.S. Postal Service addressing standards should be used.	85	14.8%
Other, please describe	28	4.9%

Online Survey Page: ISGS281

Should the State of Illinois fund the cost to implement GIS standards?

Yes

No

Undecided

ISGS281		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	111	14.8	76.0	76.0
	Undecided	29	3.9	19.9	95.9
	No	6	.8	4.1	100.0
	Total	146	19.5	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	553	73.8		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	603	80.5		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS282

Who should pay the cost to implement GIS standards?

- Each government agency directly affected by the standards
- The State of Illinois
- Other, please describe

ISGS282		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	The State of Illinois	50	6.7	52.1	52.1
	Each government agency directly affected by the standards	35	4.7	36.5	88.5
	Other, please describe	11	1.5	11.5	100.0
	Total	96	12.8	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	603	80.5		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	653	87.2		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS29

How is your GIS program funded?

Please check all that apply.

- Budgeted in another department, but our department pays for the resources used.
- County government; some costs covered by the GIS Recorders Fee
- Budgeted within our department or organization
- County government; all costs covered by the GIS Recorders Fee
- No regular or general revenue budget; department relies upon grants/contracts
- Revenue from sale of data and/or services
- Don't know
- Other, please describe

ISGS29	Selected	
	Count	%
Budgeted in another department, but our department pays for the resources used	57	9.9%
County government; some costs covered by the GIS Recorders Fee	115	20.0%
Budgeted within our department or organization	294	51.1%
County government; all costs covered by the GIS Recorders Fee	55	9.6%
No regular or general revenue budget; department relies upon grants/contracts	39	6.8%
Revenue from sale of data and/or services	55	9.6%
Don't know	35	6.1%
Other, please describe	39	6.8%

Online Survey Page: ISGS30

Does your department or organization have plans to implement GIS?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

<i>ISGS30_1</i>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	61	8.1	44.9	44.9
	No	47	6.3	34.6	79.4
	Don't know	28	3.7	20.6	100.0
	Total	136	18.2	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	563	75.2		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	613	81.8		
Total		749	100.0		

Please indicate any impediments to implementing GIS in your department or organization.

Please check all that apply.

- Budget restrictions
- Don't know how to get started
- Lack of understanding or support by decision makers
- No computer support staff available
- No GIS staff available
- No training opportunities
- No time, too busy
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS30_2</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Budget restrictions	81	39.7%
Don't know how to get started	24	11.8%
Lack of understanding or support by decision makers	24	11.8%
No computer support staff available	26	12.7%
No GIS staff available	69	33.8%
No training opportunities	13	6.4%
No time, too busy	42	20.6%
Other, please describe	24	11.8%

Online Survey Page: ISGS31

Please prioritize the top five useful types of geospatial information GIS could provide to your department or organization, with '1 being the most useful.

- Aerial photography/digital orthophotography
- Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.
- Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.
- Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.
- Land Cover
- Land Use
- Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.
- Railroads
- Roads
- Soils
- Structures
- Tax Parcels
- Water
- Wetlands
- Zoning
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS31 Summary</i>	First		Second		Third		Fourth		Fifth	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	33	26.6%	10	8.7%	13	11.5%	12	10.7%	14	12.7%
Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	3	2.4%	13	11.3%	7	6.2%	4	3.6%	2	1.8%
Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	2	1.6%	2	1.7%	6	5.3%	0	.0%	4	3.6%
Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	23	18.5%	18	15.7%	9	8.0%	6	5.4%	6	5.5%
Land Cover	0	.0%	2	1.7%	1	.9%	1	.9%	1	.9%
Land Use	14	11.3%	17	14.8%	15	13.3%	17	15.2%	12	10.9%
Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	4	3.2%	0	.0%	3	2.7%	4	3.6%	3	2.7%
Railroads	1	.8%	0	.0%	3	2.7%	0	.0%	2	1.8%
Roads	6	4.8%	11	9.6%	14	12.4%	14	12.5%	12	10.9%
Soils	0	.0%	1	.9%	4	3.5%	3	2.7%	5	4.5%
Structures	0	.0%	6	5.2%	4	3.5%	13	11.6%	9	8.2%
Tax Parcels	15	12.1%	14	12.2%	13	11.5%	6	5.4%	8	7.3%
Water	4	3.2%	5	4.3%	5	4.4%	5	4.5%	4	3.6%
Wetlands	0	.0%	4	3.5%	2	1.8%	4	3.6%	8	7.3%
Zoning	7	5.6%	12	10.4%	13	11.5%	21	18.8%	16	14.5%
Other, please describe	12	9.7%	0	.0%	1	.9%	2	1.8%	4	3.6%

ISGS31_1 First most useful types of geospatial information		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	33	4.4	26.6	26.6
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	23	3.1	18.5	45.2
	Tax Parcels	15	2.0	12.1	57.3
	Land Use	14	1.9	11.3	68.5
	Other, please describe	12	1.6	9.7	78.2
	Zoning	7	.9	5.6	83.9
	Roads	6	.8	4.8	88.7
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	4	.5	3.2	91.9
	Water	4	.5	3.2	95.2
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	3	.4	2.4	97.6
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	2	.3	1.6	99.2
	Railroads	1	.1	.8	100.0
	Total	124	16.6	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	575	76.8		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	625	83.4		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS31_2 Second most useful types of geospatial information		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	18	2.4	15.7	15.7
	Land Use	17	2.3	14.8	30.4
	Tax Parcels	14	1.9	12.2	42.6
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	13	1.7	11.3	53.9
	Zoning	12	1.6	10.4	64.3
	Roads	11	1.5	9.6	73.9
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	10	1.3	8.7	82.6
	Structures	6	.8	5.2	87.8
	Water	5	.7	4.3	92.2
	Wetlands	4	.5	3.5	95.7
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	2	.3	1.7	97.4
	Land Cover	2	.3	1.7	99.1
	Soils	1	.1	.9	100.0
	Total	115	15.4	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	584	78.0		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	634	84.6		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS31_3 Third most useful types of geospatial information		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Land Use	15	2.0	13.3	13.3
	Roads	14	1.9	12.4	25.7
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	13	1.7	11.5	37.2
	Tax Parcels	13	1.7	11.5	48.7
	Zoning	13	1.7	11.5	60.2
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	9	1.2	8.0	68.1
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	7	.9	6.2	74.3
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	6	.8	5.3	79.6
	Water	5	.7	4.4	84.1
	Soils	4	.5	3.5	87.6
	Structures	4	.5	3.5	91.2
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	3	.4	2.7	93.8
	Railroads	3	.4	2.7	96.5
	Wetlands	2	.3	1.8	98.2
	Land Cover	1	.1	.9	99.1
	Other, please describe	1	.1	.9	100.0
	Total	113	15.1	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	586	78.2		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	636	84.9		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS31_4 Fourth most useful types of geospatial information		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zoning	21	2.8	18.8	18.8
	Land Use	17	2.3	15.2	33.9
	Roads	14	1.9	12.5	46.4
	Structures	13	1.7	11.6	58.0
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	12	1.6	10.7	68.8
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	6	.8	5.4	74.1
	Tax Parcels	6	.8	5.4	79.5
	Water	5	.7	4.5	83.9
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	4	.5	3.6	87.5
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	4	.5	3.6	91.1
	Wetlands	4	.5	3.6	94.6
	Soils	3	.4	2.7	97.3
	Other, please describe	2	.3	1.8	99.1
	Land Cover	1	.1	.9	100.0
	Total	112	15.0	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	587	78.4		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	637	85.0		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS31_5 Fifth most useful types of geospatial information		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Zoning	16	2.1	14.5	14.5
	Aerial photography/digital orthophotography	14	1.9	12.7	27.3
	Land Use	12	1.6	10.9	38.2
	Roads	12	1.6	10.9	49.1
	Structures	9	1.2	8.2	57.3
	Tax Parcels	8	1.1	7.3	64.5
	Wetlands	8	1.1	7.3	71.8
	Jurisdictional boundaries - counties, municipalities, public land survey, etc.	6	.8	5.5	77.3
	Soils	5	.7	4.5	81.8
	Geology - surficial, bedrock, aquifers, etc.	4	.5	3.6	85.5
	Water	4	.5	3.6	89.1
	Other, please describe	4	.5	3.6	92.7
	Public lands - parks, forest preserves, etc.	3	.4	2.7	95.5
	Elevation - contours, DEM, DTM, LiDAR, etc.	2	.3	1.8	97.3
	Railroads	2	.3	1.8	99.1
	Land Cover	1	.1	.9	100.0
	Total	110	14.7	100.0	
Missing	Not asked/No response	589	78.6		
	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Total	639	85.3		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS32

What applications do you think GIS could be most useful to your department or organization?

Please check all that apply.

- Community Development
- Economic Development
- Emergency Dispatch
- Emergency Management
- Environment
- Health
- Land Cover
- Land Use
- Law Enforcement
- Permit Review
- Planning
- Tax Assessment
- Transportation
- Vehicle Tracking
- Zoning
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS32</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Community Development	78	38.2%
Economic Development	75	36.8%
Emergency Dispatch	28	13.7%
Emergency Management	51	25.0%
Environment	39	19.1%
Health	15	7.4%
Land Cover	21	10.3%
Land Use	82	40.2%
Law Enforcement	48	23.5%
Permit Review	47	23.0%
Planning	82	40.2%
Tax Assessment	27	13.2%
Transportation	37	18.1%
Vehicle Tracking	16	7.8%
Zoning	66	32.4%
Other, please describe	18	8.8%

Online Survey Page: ISGS40

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following questions:

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in identifying and applying for grants.

My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in creating and supporting partnerships with other agencies and organizations.

My department is willing to cooperate in joint funding partnerships with other agencies and organizations in order to develop needed GIS data.

My department is willing to share GIS data with other government agencies in order to establish regional capabilities such as public safety, emergency services applications, etc.

ISGS40 Summary	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in identifying and applying for grants.	33.1%	41.5%	19.6%	4.2%	1.6%
My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in creating and supporting partnerships with other agencies and organizations.	27.6%	47.0%	21.9%	2.4%	1.1%
My department is willing to cooperate in joint funding partnerships with other agencies and organizations in order to develop needed GIS data.	20.3%	32.2%	38.9%	6.8%	1.9%
My department is willing to share GIS data with other government agencies in order to establish regional capabilities such as public safety, emergency services applications, etc.	35.2%	41.9%	21.0%	1.1%	.8%

ISGS40_1 My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in identifying and applying for grants.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	211	28.2	33.1	33.1
	Agree	265	35.4	41.5	74.6
	Undecided	125	16.7	19.6	94.2
	Disagree	27	3.6	4.2	98.4
	Strongly disagree	10	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	638	85.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	61	8.1		
	Total	111	14.8		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS40_2 My department would make use of a program in Illinois to assist in creating and supporting partnerships with other agencies and organizations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	176	23.5	27.6	27.6
	Agree	300	40.1	47.0	74.6
	Undecided	140	18.7	21.9	96.6
	Disagree	15	2.0	2.4	98.9
	Strongly disagree	7	.9	1.1	100.0
	Total	638	85.2	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	61	8.1		
	Total	111	14.8		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS40_3 My department is willing to cooperate in joint funding partnerships with other agencies and organizations in order to develop needed GIS data.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	129	17.2	20.3	20.3
	Agree	205	27.4	32.2	52.4
	Undecided	248	33.1	38.9	91.4
	Disagree	43	5.7	6.8	98.1
	Strongly disagree	12	1.6	1.9	100.0
	Total	637	85.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	62	8.3		
	Total	112	15.0		
Total		749	100.0		

ISGS40_4 My department is willing to share GIS data with other government agencies in order to establish regional capabilities such as public safety, emergency services applications, etc.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	224	29.9	35.2	35.2
	Agree	267	35.6	41.9	77.1
	Undecided	134	17.9	21.0	98.1
	Disagree	7	.9	1.1	99.2
	Strongly disagree	5	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	637	85.0	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	62	8.3		
	Total	112	15.0		
Total		749	100.0		

Online Survey Page: ISGS41

What is your level of interest in attending GIS conferences, classes or workshops?

- Very interested
- Interested
- Somewhat interested
- Not interested

<i>ISGS41_1</i>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very interested	230	30.7	35.3	35.3
	Interested	182	24.3	28.0	63.3
	Somewhat interested	164	21.9	25.2	88.5
	Not interested	75	10.0	11.5	100.0
	Total	651	86.9	100.0	
Missing	Did not participate in survey	50	6.7		
	Not asked/No response	48	6.4		
	Total	98	13.1		
Total		749	100.0		

Please indicate any impediments keeping you from participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops.

Please check all that apply.

- Budget restrictions
- Department or organization doesn't encourage or allow participation
- No time, I'm too busy
- No impediments, I'm just not interested
- Other, please describe

<i>ISGS41_2</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Impediment to participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops: Budget restrictions	352	50.4%
Impediment to participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops: Department or organization doesn't encourage or allow participation	28	4.0%
Impediment to participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops: No time, I'm too busy	302	43.2%
Impediment to participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops: No impediments, I'm just not interested	52	7.4%
Impediment to participating in GIS conferences, classes or workshops: Other, please describe	77	11.0%

Online Survey Page: NI

Please indicate why you choose not to participate.

I don't know anything about my department or organization's use of GIS.

My department or organization doesn't use GIS and has no interest in doing so.

My department or organization is interested in using GIS but I'm not the appropriate person.

Other reason, please specify

<i>NI_1</i>	Selected	
	Count	%
Choose not to participate because: I don't know anything about my department or organization's use of GIS.	12	24.0%
Choose not to participate because: My department or organization doesn't use GIS and has no interest in doing so.	10	20.0%
Choose not to participate because: My department or organization is interested in using GIS but I'm not the appropriate person.	7	14.0%
Choose not to participate because: Other reason, please specify	12	24.0%

Online Survey Page: ThankYou

Please wait while your answers are being saved.

This screen will close by itself.

Thank you for taking the time to provide us with this essential information.