



# REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 25, 2009 – 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

## Community Planning Association

**Notice:** This packet contains only the documents listed with an asterisk (\*) in the agenda. The entire packet, including all attachments is available at <http://www.compassidaho.org/documents/people/rgac/agenda062509.pdf>. The online document requires Adobe Acrobat to read it; COMPASS' homepage <http://www.compassidaho.org> contains a free download link if you need a copy. The online document includes bookmarks at the left of the screen that are named to correspond to agenda items that have attachments. Clicking on a bookmark will take you directly to the named document.

### \*\* AGENDA \*\*

#### I. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

2:00

#### II. OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

2:05

#### III. CONSENT AGENDA

2:10 \*A. Approve April 23, 2009 Meeting Minutes

#### IV. ACTION ITEM

2:10 \*A. RGAC will consider TWIG Proposal Chair

#### V. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

2:15 A. Short Term Chair

*Progress report of prelim file*  
*Progress report on centerline file*

2:30 B. Mid Term  
*Progress report on Data List Matrix (email attachment)*  
*Feedback on Data Distribution*

2:45 C. Long Term  
*Discussion on issues and approach to a Regional GIS*

3:00 D. Agency Report Rod Collins  
*Presentation by City of Nampa Staff*

3:15 E. Performance Monitoring Report (PMR) Eric Adolfson  
*Review example of analysis done to complete PMR*

#### VI. OTHER

3:25 A. New Business or Announcements

B. Next Meeting: Date and Time TBD, at COMPASS

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

3:30

**\*Enclosures - Times are approximate. Agenda is subject to change.**

*REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE*  
*APRIL 23, 2009*  
*COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION*



**\*\*MINUTES\*\***

*ATTENDEES:* Nathan Bentley, Ada County Information Technology, *Chair*  
 Rod Collins, City of Nampa, *Vice Chair*  
 Jason Cooperdock, Canyon County  
 Brian Emmen, Idaho Transportation Department  
 Mike Hickok, Ada County Assessor's Office (*for Anne Kawalec*)  
 Gary Shane Lim, City of Meridian  
 Dave Marston, City of Caldwell  
 Chuck Spencer, Ada County Highway District  
 Bill Vaughan, City of Eagle

*MEMBERS ABSENT:* Mike Borzick, City of Kuna  
 Tina Fenske, City of Garden City  
 Miguel Gaddi, Public Participation Committee  
 Jim Hetherington, City of Boise  
 Leon Jensen, Canyon County Development Services  
 Kathy Knapp, Canyon Highway District  
 Todd Milich, Nampa Highway District

*OTHERS PRESENT:* Eric Adolfson, COMPASS  
 Ross Dodge, COMPASS  
 Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

*CALL TO ORDER*

Chair Bentley called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

*AGENDA ADDITIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS*

Ross Dodge requested adding an item to the end of the agenda regarding a brief presentation of the Performance Monitoring Report.

Chair Bentley commented that he would like to add a discussion item to the agenda regarding a request received from the now dissolved technical working group; sending a proposal to RGAC to take on the role of "coordinator" for technical issues and problems and potentially make it an action item for the next scheduled RGAC meeting.

*OPEN DISCUSSION*

Ross Dodge gave a status report on the 2010 Ortho Project. A meeting was held with the remaining partners where details of the Request for Proposal and quality control process were discussed. This project is moving forward.

Since a quorum was not present, Chair Bentley moved to the Information Items.

*INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS*

*A. Discuss Preliminary Plat Workflow*

Chair Bentley stated this item is a continuation from the last two RGAC meetings. At the last meeting Anne Kawalec of the Ada County Assessor's Office, discussed how she receives preliminary plats and how the process works through her office. At the conclusion of her discussion, Anne suggested that Ada County members go back to their respective agencies and find out how their preliminary information is obtained and distributed, and present those findings at the April RGAC meeting.

Shane Lim commented that the City of Meridian is in the midst of a change in process so for now, the distribution of preliminary plat information will continue with its present process: the developer brings in their application and takes it to planning, planning makes sure it is complete and once it is complete, the packet is sent out to everyone on the list. From the packet, GIS draws the boundary of the pre-plat which is put into the subdivision layer as a pre-plat; then, the water and sewer lines are added and sent to Karie Glenn for modeling. That same packet is also transmitted to Ada County and processed as Anne explained last month.

Chair Bentley stated that at the last RGAC meeting, Mike Borzick with the City of Kuna said they were going to start the process of submitting shape files to land records, rather than the paper documentation.

On the Canyon County side, Jason Copperdock said a meeting was held with Nampa and Caldwell. At this time the Canyon County Assessor's office is not looking to change their present process regarding preliminary plats; however, adding new fields in the layers is acceptable.

Ross referred to an email he sent to RGAC regarding streamlining the information pipeline and determining core fields that would be of value to individual agencies and the broader region of users. Ross said another field has been brought to his attention. Is it possible to get residential units out of your processes? Is the data difficult to gather?

Chair Bentley replied it is more of a range versus a reality and it may, or may not, work for the preliminary plats. There is a big difference between 10 dwelling units or 2 dwelling units.

Eric Adolfson said the perspective is to get an idea of what is potentially being built. Preliminary plats do change over time but the idea is just to identify what's happening. Staff is looking to have an active layer.

Dave Marston asked if the information is to go out prior to it being officially adopted or accepted as a preliminary plat or after the fact. In the City of Caldwell's case, by the time it has gone through the process and actually becomes an approved preliminary plat, it has already gone through Planning and Zoning and the City Council for approval based on what was presented. The issue of going from 3,000 units to 700 units would have already been addressed. The information Caldwell would deliver is approved preliminary plats. No tracking is done on pre-preliminary plats.

Ross asked if Canyon County would be able to gather the information by May. After discussion, it was decided that Canyon, Nampa, and Caldwell would have a comparable data set ready for distribution in June 2009.

Chair Bentley recommended moving forward with the field names as presented at RGAC's March 2009 meeting.

*Quorum now present, Chair Bentley moved to the Consent Agenda.*

CONSENT AGENDA

A. *Approve March 26, 2009 Meeting Minutes*

*Rod Collins moved and Shane Lim seconded to approve the March 26, 2009 meeting minutes as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.*

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

B. *Discuss Distribution of Regional GIS Data*

Ross Dodge stated that in previous RGAC meetings, there was discussion regarding short-term projects such as data sets that can be modified to work regionally (previous discussion), mid-term projects such as coordinating the data distribution methodology, and long-term projects such as looking at a federated approach to GIS and more policy related issues. The aim of these three falls within the mission of RGAC is to coordinate regional GIS data. Last week Ross emailed a distribution of regional data as a first attempt in addressing the mid-term distribution issue. Ross asked if:

- 1) the information is useful
- 2) if there was an adequate methodology or if there was way to improve the distribution process.

Discussion:

- Email has a size limitation so Ross could not send out the large files or include too many files. Ftp is a better technology for this kind of distribution because it doesn't have size limitations. Also ZIP files attached to an email are a problem for some recipients.

Eric explained the COMPASS ftp site; it's not a dedicated ftp site, but simply a part of the COMPASS website. It has memory limitations so data cannot be left out there indefinitely.

- It was suggested that the type of ftp site depended on its use. Would it be used by the public, consulting firms, or just other GIS agencies?

Ross replied the customer base will only be for RGAC agencies. There are no plans to make this data freely available to anybody at anytime.

It was agreed by committee members present that the next step in addressing mid-term issues of data distribution is to post regional data on the COMPASS ftp site. This group will be notified at the beginning of each month when it is available for downloaded. COMPASS will keep data posted for a few days and then it will be removed.

Chair Bentley asked if it would be beneficial to COMPASS if RGAC would forward a recommendation to the COMPASS Board to update the COMPASS servers or move to the newer technologies so that we can start replicating the data and looking towards this as the regional clearinghouse for data.

Ross replied that he can see this committee working toward that goal but sees this as a long-term issue and many questions would have to be answered at this table (justification, anticipated cost, usage, etc.) before presenting the idea.

Ross recommended for future meetings, that the group continue discussion regarding the short-term, mid-term, and long-term approach. We will continue in the short-term to work on this preliminary file, but

would like the committee's opinions with regard to other files, focusing in on making regionally compatible files (i.e., subdivisions).

Chair Bentley stated that with regard to the next data layer, there is a need to finish the regional centerline file layer. He reminded the group that work has already been done on that file; it is low hanging fruit that we should finish. A yearly update cycle on schools would also be helpful.

Dave Marston commented that it would be helpful to coordinate a matrix of available data sets. Which layers would be beneficial regionally?

Chair Bentley suggested the group bring data layer lists to the next scheduled RGAC meeting. Ross requested that committee members email their respective spreadsheets to him and he will create a master list for the next meeting. Ross said that he will send out an email in May 2009 with an ftp site and asked that this group download the data and take it to their respective planning staff to see if it is of use.

#### *TWIG REQUEST*

Chair Bentley read an email he received from Jimae Haynes who was Chair of the technical working group (TWIG). This group dissolved in March 2009 and felt RGAC would be the committee to advance the tasks they had been performing. The group sent a proposal to RGAC to become a coordinator for technical issues and problems. Chair Bentley reviewed the list of issues.

He then asked if RGAC is willing to consider having technical working groups so that as regional data or technical issues are raised, RGAC would be willing to host those groups. Is it in RGAC's charter to do so?

Chuck Spencer commented that he does not see the RGAC group getting involved in the nitty-gritty technical issues.

Mike Hickok stated TWIG's intent is to make technical expertise available to RGAC through some of the TWIG members. If there is a technical issue the RGAC wants evaluated, they could call on TWIG to look into it.

Ross stated that RGAC could assign a technical working group to look at this long-term approach of Federation and, it wouldn't necessarily have to be anyone sitting on RGAC.

Chair Bentley suggested that this group take time to consider this issue and further discussion will be brought back at the next RGAC meeting.

#### *Draft 2009 Communities in Motion Performance Monitoring Report (PMR)*

Ross Dodge gave a brief overview of the draft 2009 **Communities in Motion** PMR. Committee members are welcome to review this document which is located on the COMPASS website: <http://www.communitiesinmotion.org/plandocuments.html>.

Ross commented that at RGAC's next scheduled meeting, Eric Adolfson will give a presentation of how these analyses were created.

#### *A. New Business/Announcements*

Rod Collins will present the City of Nampa's Agency Report at RGAC's June 2009 meeting.

Brian Emmen will present the Idaho Transportation Department's Agency Report at RGAC's July 2009 meeting.

*B. Next Meeting:* Thursday June 25, 2009, 2:00 p.m., at COMPASS.

*ADJOURNMENT*

*There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.*

T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RGAC\Minutes\minutes042309.docx

## TWIG Proposal

-----Original Message-----

From: Jimae Haynes [mailto:jhaynes@cityofboise.org]

Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 3:44 PM

To: Nathan Bentley; Ross Dodge

Cc: Jimae Haynes

Subject: RGAC and TWIG's proposal

Hi Nathan.

Being as you are the chairperson for the RGAC, I thought I'd take this opportunity to gently lobby for RGAC to consider and respond to TWIG's "dying" proposal to "take on a role of "coordinator" for technical issues/problems..." (Please see the notes, attached, of the last TWIG meeting for the details of the proposal)

People are already asking about reviving the TWIG, including a couple of inquiries at the most recent SIG meeting, where they specifically asked me to nudge RGAC for some kind of response to the TWIG proposal. So consider this the nudge.

I have the feeling that there are 2 "camps" on the TWIG revival front - one camp desperately needs a regular forum for discussing and getting help on detailed, work related technical stuff like caching with ArcGIS Server; the other camp wants less meetings in their lives but still recognizes that there will be a need, from time to time, for special focused research on technical GIS issues affecting the "region." I think the RGAC can be the driver for the second camp (per the TWIG proposal), but the needs for the first camp are currently going unmet. I'm not sure what solution will come up for that need - time will tell.

If RGAC discusses the TWIG proposal and has any response for the TWIG members, you can, if you like, send the response to me and I will forward it on to the ex-TWIG group.

Sincerely, Jimae

### Excerpts from the minutes of the last TWIG meeting:

- It was the group's opinion that we'd like RGAC to address these concerns and take a broader view of the RGAC scope to include regional issues/problems that are not limited to COMPASS's mission to support local and regional planning (only).
- The concept is that working groups will be created when needed for a specific purpose and duration, and after a potential solution has been developed and presented for review, the working group will be dissolved. The working groups will be composed of the people who are the best technical experts to tackle the problem and/or people who have a stake in the solution (but not the entire TWIG membership). RGAC, being composed of GIS Managers with a direct line to regional political authorities, will provide oversight and support to the working groups, and work to solve any political barriers to technical solutions.