



REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 27, 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/agenda082709.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 June 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes

- IV. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
2:15 *A. Discuss Local Update of Census Addresses
 (LUCA) and 2010 Data Strategies
 Local Update for Census Addressing (LUCA) Ross Dodge
 Valley Regional Transit (VRT) Bus Stops Eric Adolfson
 ISDI Draft Structures Data Model Nathan Bentley

- 2:30 B. Short Term Nathan Bentley
 Progress report of prelim file
 Progress report on centerline file

- 2:45 C. Mid Term Nathan Bentley
 Progress report on Google Group
 Discuss ftp Distribution Plan

- 3:15 D. 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: October 22, 2009; 2:00 p.m. at COMPASS

- VII. ADJOURNMENT
3:30

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

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RGAC\Agendas\agenda082709.docx



REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JUNE 25, 2009

COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

****MINUTES****

ATTENDEES: Nathan Bentley, Ada County Information Technology, **Chair**
 Mike Borzick, City of Kuna
 Rod Collins, City of Nampa, **Vice Chair**
 Jason Cooperdock, Canyon County
 Tina Fenske, City of Garden City
 Jim Hetherington, City of Boise
 Anne Kawalec, Ada County Assessor's Office
 Kathy Knapp, Canyon Highway District
 Dave Marston, City of Caldwell
 Chuck Spencer, Ada County Highway District
 Bill Vaughan, City of Eagle

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brian Emmen, Idaho Transportation Department
 Miguel Gaddi, Public Participation Committee
 Gary Shane Lim, City of Meridian
 Leon Jensen, Canyon County Development Services
 Todd Milich, Nampa Highway District

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Adolfson, COMPASS
 Nathan Dale, COMPASS
 Ross Dodge, COMPASS
 Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bentley called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Tina Fenske asked if RGAC was still going to meet monthly or bi-monthly. Ross Dodge replied that one meeting was skipped but no recommendation has been made by the committee regarding the meeting schedule. Chair Bentley asked for the group's feedback. After discussion, **it was the consensus of committee members present that RGAC meet bi-monthly.**

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve April 23, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Chuck Spencer moved and Dave Marston seconded to approve the April 23, 2009 meeting minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item

A. RGAC will consider TWIG Proposal

Chair Bentley presented a memorandum from Jimae Haynes regarding TWIG's proposal for RGAC to consider taking on the role of coordinator for technical issues/problems. TWIG's request was discussed at RGAC's April 23, 2009 meeting and at such time Chair Bentley asked the committee to consider this issue.

Ross commented that after the April discussion, it was stated that the decision would be brought to a vote. Ross said that TWIG has asked RGAC to take on the role of coordinator for technical issues/problems, because RGAC has access to the elected officials; a motion should be made by this committee, and that decision forwarded to Jimae Haynes.

Discussion:

- SIG and SDC are at the technical level not RGAC. If there are policy issues that need to be discussed, they can bring it to RGAC.
- SIG and SDC are the logical places for technical issues, not RGAC. RGAC, however, could assign a group to get involved in the "nuts and bolts" issues.

Ross quoted from the TWIG proposal: "...there will be a need, from time to time, for special focused research on technical GIS issues affecting the 'region.' I think RGAC can be the driver for the second camp (per the TWIG proposal)." Ross commented that if RGAC were looking at specific regional geo-database issues; it could be a TWIG working group to work out the "nuts and bolts" rather than the SIG or SDC.

- If there is a technical issue within Canyon County, the SDC would bring together that technical group, and the same with Ada County.
- Sometimes there is a need for TWIG groups within the counties (i.e., city limit TWIGs).

After further discussion, **it was the consensus of committee members present that the TWIG proposal was inherent in the RGAC mission and thus a formal action is not necessary. RGAC will generate a TWIG as needed.**

Chair Bentley stated that he will report to Jimae that it is the consensus of RGAC, not to formally adopt their proposal but RGAC would generate a TWIG when special research is requested.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Short Term

Chair Bentley gave a brief summary of RGAC'S April 23, 2009 discussion.

Anne Kawalec stated that prelims are a hot topic and Ada County Development Services has received calls from developers looking at lot counts. The City of Kuna has a shape file of boundaries, from which Dan Narsavage has developed a schema of subdivision and prelim boundaries. It is working well but is not ready to go live at this time until further data is received. A standard naming convention is needed for the fields. If there is interest, Dan will email the schema to this group and requests feedback. This is a work in progress.

Ross reported that Nampa, Caldwell, and Canyon County have made changes to the prelim schema which resulted in a simple merge on those common fields. Ross presented a map reflecting the results of their work. He reported the time required to merge these files has dropped from a couple

days to just 10 minutes. There are still some issues to be addressed before it can be used for analysis. Ross will continue to work with Nampa, Caldwell, and Canyon County to refine this file.

Chair Bentley stated another topic of discussion is the two-county centerline file that would be routable for 911 and further applications. Eric Adolfson has been the point of contact for Ada and Canyon Counties.

Eric commented the original reason for this task was for routing purposes for emergency services. Three steps are involved in this process:

- East to West alignment
- North to South alignment
- Addressing

Eric said that progress has been made; a common shape file of points was sent for both counties to align their centerlines. Both counties then realigned their respective centerlines to snap to these points. The result is that the centerlines visually line up but they are not yet close enough for routing purposes.

Chair Bentley stated that this issue should be presented as a quick update on each agenda. Anne asked if this could be a TWIG opportunity. For the time being, Eric will continue to work with Sara and Forrest.

B. Mid Term

Ross stated that currently we all maintain a variety of data with some being of interest to other agencies. However, we have no coordinated way of knowing who has what or what's of interest. Ross said this data list spreadsheet is a first step in the mid-term idea of coordinating our resources.

Ross asked if it is necessary to have everything of everyone's data or just the regionally significant data.

Chair Bentley replied that this data inventory list is good; it should be exhaustive and not just contain regional data.

Ross explained that he added two fields; one that identifies whether or not it's sharable and another that identifies other agencies interested in a specific data layer.

He asked the committee to address the question of whether or not the data is sharable; is it COMPASS' role to be the distributor of this data or should we direct requests to the data steward.

It was a consensus of the committee members present, that COMPASS should act as a resource for the contact, but it would be better to direct data request to the source.

Ross asked if the group wanted to address the ease of access to data; should we make it accessible to any and everyone (i.e., downloading data from the website) or should we establish some restrictions.

After discussion, **it was the consensus of members present, that RGAC members have access to data via ftp or website, but that public requests should be directed to the data steward.**

C. Long Term

Chair Bentley offered an FYI to members about taking security measures on their map services if they do not want them displayed on Google. He said that any map service that has been published can be reviewed with a Goggle search such as mapservices idaho. We need to keep this in mind if there are to be restrictions on what we want to be made public.

Chair Bentley asked the group to think about how we make this useable for this group and an asset for the region. If there is data that can be shared, this would be a good option at a limited cost.

Ross commented that he attended an Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC) meeting where they are looking at a Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III Governance Transition Plan which addresses the issue of where they are and where they want to be. Ross found it interesting with regard to the parallels the IGC is working on as compared to this committee's work on a Short-Term, Mid-Term, and Long-Term approach. The IGC is discussing a Framework Standards Development Policy; looking at data standards, which this committee is doing with the prelims and centerline files; as well as coordinating the information flow. IGC is also working on an ESRI License Agreement with regard to the most efficient utilization of hardware/software/licenses among agencies.

IGC has a State Agency GIS Manager Group with three divisions:

- University of Idaho - data distribution center inside Idaho
- Idaho State University - training and education center
- Boise Area – Governance

The IGC is discussing a Regional Resource Center proposal; centers designed to work for those in the region. Tyson Taylor at Boise State University (BSU) is proposing that BSU be the training and support resource center but not a data warehouse.

Ross stated because of the parallels between RGAC and the IGC, it is important to be informed as to what is happening at the state level so that we can all work together.

D. Agency Report

Rod Collins presented an agency report for the City of Nampa.

E. Performance Monitoring Report

In the interest of time, this item was tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

Eric commented that he set up an RGAC Goggle Groups page which is intended to enhance communications. Email updates will be sent to those who have logged in and set up an account. A status report will be presented at the next scheduled meeting.

Other

A. New Business/Announcements

Chair Bentley commented that the GIS-EOC (emergency operations center) is planning an exercise in April 2010 but a workshop will be held prior to this event; an announcement will be forward to this committee to attend.

An Idaho Transportation Department Agency Report will be presented at RGAC's August 2009 meeting.

B. Next Meeting: Thursday, August 27, 2009, 2:00 p.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

Rod Collins moved and Tina Fenske seconded adjournment at 3:30 p.m. Motion carries.

T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RGAC\Minutes\minutes062509.docx



COMPASS
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION
of Southwest Idaho

MEMORANDUM

To: Regional Geographic Advisory Committee

FROM: Ross Dodge, Principal Planner

DATE: August 20, 2009

RE: **Discuss Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA) and 2010 Data Strategies**

ACTION REQUESTED:

Information only.

BACKGROUND:

- In October 2007, COMPASS introduced the Census LUCA program to RGAC. At issue was the strategy for updating their addressing information in preparation for the 2010 Census. The committee at that time agreed to let COMPASS take the lead and be the point of contact with the Census Bureau. COMPASS worked throughout the process with member agency staff involvement.
- In April 2008 COMPASS gave a LUCA progress report to the RGAC. At that meeting staff also presented the options for appealing the Census Bureau's review of LUCA submittals.
- In July 2008 COMPASS reported to RGAC on the completed transmittal to the Census and agreed to return to RGAC when Census results were completed.

COMPASS staff considered several data sources including building permits, assessor parcel data, street-level and aerial views of housing units, and ground-surveying done by government agencies in reviewing and updating the address lists. Staff worked with individual member agencies to make 31,763 corrections to the Census Bureau list.

STATUS:

RGAC membership has changed since July 2008, but staff must complete the obligation to update RGAC. The Census Bureau used the LUCA lists edited by COMPASS during the canvassing of housing units this spring and summer. They will begin mailing the LUCA feedback materials in October 2009 and LUCA participants will have 30 calendar days to file an appeal. COMPASS will work with the original LUCA participants to ensure all members have opportunity to respond.

What is important to RGAC is developing a strategy for handling the resulting GIS data to be dispensed by the Census Bureau in 2010/2011. The committee will begin to consider these options.

RD:dw T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RGAC\Packets\082709\rgacmmo-LUCA-082709.docx

DRAFT

Content Standard for Structures

Subcommittee of the Public Safety TWG

Eric Smith
Teton County, Structures Project Manager
89 N Main
Driggs, ID. 83440
esmith@co.teton.id.us

Dan Spinosa
Bonner County
1500 Highway 2, ste. 214
Sandpoint, ID 83864
dspinosa@co.bonner.id.us

Scot Van Hoff
USGS
230 Collins Rd
Boise ID 83702
svanhoff@usgs.gov

Dave Christiansen
Kootenai County
451 Government Way
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815
dchristianson@co.kootenai.id.us

Bill Reynolds
Nez Perce County
1230 Main St
PO Box 896
Lewiston, ID 83501
billreynolds@co.nezperce.id.us

Frank Roberts
Coeur d' Alene Tribe
PO Box 408, 820 A St
Plummer ID 83851
fmroberts@cdatribe-nsn.gov

Bruce Godfrey
University of Idaho
1000 W. Hubbard Ave., Suite 242
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814-2277
bgodfrey@uidaho.edu

Craig Rindlisbacher (or Kade Smith)
Madison County / City of Rexburg
12 N. Center St
Rexburg, ID. 83440
craigr@rexburg.org

Table of Contents

Introduction	page 1
Draft Structures Data Model	page 2
Additional Considerations	page 3
References	page 3

Introduction

This document describes the minimum required characteristics of a common data content model for a statewide structures dataset. The content model is intended to facilitate integration and sharing of structures data and to enhance dissemination and use of accurate, seamless, and up-to-date structure information.

Many organizations have business needs that could benefit from a statewide coverage of structures from local to federal government agencies, and many organizations from the private sector. Some anticipated uses of this dataset are: 911 support, emergency response planning, building inspections/appraisals, economic analysis, and cartographic enhancement.

This data model was developed by the Structures subcommittee of the Idaho Public Safety TWG for the Idaho Spatial Data Infrastructure (ISDI). Structures subcommittee members are: Eric Smith, Bill Reynolds, Bruce Godfrey, Dan Spinosa, Dave Christiansen, Frank Roberts, Jimae Haynes, and Craig Rindlisbacher.

The idea of including non-structural aspects such as a valley, spring, or neighborhood to this dataset was discussed throughout the planning process, and it was generally agreed that such features belong in a separate layer perhaps called "Common Place", which may be developed by this group later on. Consequently, this theme is intended to represent locations with an addressable structure.

Draft Structures Data Model

Data is modeled as a point geometry type

FIELD NAME	DATA TYPE	LENGTH	REQUIRED	SHORT DESCRIPTION
GIS_STEW	TEXT/STRING	20	yes	STEWARD OF THE DATA
APA_TYPE	INTEGER	5	yes	*NUMERIC CODING SYSTEM
HOUSE_NUM	INTEGER		no	HOUSE NUMBER
HOUSE_SFX	TEXT/STRING	3	no	HOUSE SUFFIX
PRE_DIR	TEXT/STRING	2	no	PRE DIRECTION
ST_NAME	TEXT/STRING	40	no	STREET NAME
NAME_SFX	TEXT/STRING	4	no	ROAD NAME SUFFIX
POST_DIR	TEXT/STRING	2	no	POST DIRECTION
SUB_UNIT	TEXT/STRING	10	no	SUB UNIT
SUB_UNIT_TYPE	TEXT/STRING	10	no	SUB UNIT TYPE
COMMUNITY	TEXT/STRING	20	no	COMMUNITY
STATE	TEXT/STRING	2	no	STATE
ZIP_4	INTEGER		no	ZIP CODE
LOCAL_ID	TEXT/STRING	12	no	LOCAL ID NUMBER
CARTO_TYPE	TEXT/STRING	15	no	GENERAL STRUCTURE TYPE - LEVEL 1
STRUCTURE_TYPE	TEXT/STRING	15	no	MORE SPECIFIC TYPE - LEVEL 2
COMMENTS	TEXT/STRING	250	no	MOST SPECIFIC TYPE - LEVEL 3
LAT	INTEGER	6	no	LATTITUDE
LONG	INTEGER	6	no	LONGITUDE

* The American Planning Association (APA) has developed a numeric structure coding system. Local GIS stewards may use this system at level 1, level 2, or both levels, depending on their business needs. The level 2** categories shown here are specifically included as required values. (see below)

- **Level 1:** <http://myapa.planning.org/LBCS/GeneralInfo/>
 - 1000: Residential Building
 - 2000: Commercial building and other specialized structures
 - 3000: Public assembly structure
 - 4000: Institutional or community facility
 - **4110: Hospital building
 - **4200: School or university buildings
 - **4510: Fire and rescue building
 - **4520: Police station

- ****4530: Emergency operation center**
 - ****4600: Jails, penitentiaries, detention centers, correctional facilities**
 - **5000: Transportation-related facility**
 - **6000: Utility and other non-building structures**
 - **7000: Specialized military structures**
 - **8000: Sheds, farm buildings, or agricultural facilities**
- **Level 2: (see complete list at)**
<http://myapa.planning.org/lbcs/standards/view.htm?Level=4&style=tree&Dimension=Structure>

Additional Considerations

Data Quality

Other considerations

References

1. Description of Structures
 - a. *2006 International Building Code*; "That which is built or constructed"; DEFINITIONS – "Structure", pg. 20 (see chapter 3 for specific details)
 - b. APA Structures Definition: <http://myapa.planning.org/LBCS/GeneralInfo/>
2. Structure Type Standards
 - a. USGS
 - i. <http://www.ncrs.fs.fed.us/4153/deltawest/landcover/AndersonDoc.pdf>
 - ii. <http://edc2.usgs.gov/pubslists/factsheets/fs18999.pdf>
 - b. USFS
 - i. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsj/projects/frdb/tables/table121.html>
 - c. APA
 - i. <http://myapa.planning.org/LBCS/GeneralInfo/>
 - ii. <http://myapa.planning.org/lbcs/standards/view.htm?Level=4&style=tree&Dimension=Structure>
 - iii. *Standard Land-Use Coding Manual*:
<http://myapa.planning.org/LBCS/OtherStandards/Downloads/sluclm.pdf>
 - d. IBC
 - i. Chapter 3 IBC
 - e. NAICS
 - i. <http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/>
3. Other Standards
 - a. U.S. Postal Addressing Standards, Publication 28
 - b. Oregon Geospatial Data Addressing Standard -
<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/standards/docs/ORAddressContentStdv1.pdf>