



*REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 4, 2007
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION*

****MINUTES****

ATTENDEES: Nathan Bentley, Ada County Information Technology, *Chair*
Rick Fisher, Ada County Information Technology
Christine Floor, Valley Regional Transit
Miguel Gaddi, Public Participation Committee
Wendy Howell, City of Middleton
Bonnie Ford Le-Compte, Canyon County Development Services
Shane Lim, City of Meridian (*for Anna Canning*)
Chad Lynch, Canyon County Assessor, *Vice Chair*
Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise (*for Bruce Eggleston*)
Tina Fenske, City of Garden City (*for Jenah Thornborrow*)
Bill Vaughan, City of Eagle

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brian Billingsley, City of Caldwell
Norm Holm, City of Nampa

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Adolfson, COMPASS
Dave Alvord, City of Eagle
Ross Dodge, COMPASS
Carl Miller, COMPASS
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bentley called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Introductions were made of all attendees.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. *Approve May 9, 2007 Meeting Minutes*

Chad Lynch moved and Shane Lim seconded to approve the May 9, 2007 minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

A. *Approve Strategy for Administering Local Update and Census Addresses (LUCA)*

Carl Miller presented COMPASS' role in the 2010 Census LUCA Program. Carl explained that the role that COMPASS and its member agencies will play in the LUCA program need to be defined so all parties can make necessary arrangements for scheduling the workload and coordinating the data. Carl reviewed two broadly-scoped participation strategies for consideration.

Ross Dodge explained that under Option 1, the participating agencies in issuing the addresses would enter into an agreement with the Census Bureau and get that address list for their respective area. In Option 2, COMPASS would receive that list. The database file will have a spatial component through this process. RGAC is an advisory committee to the COMPASS Board and therefore a recommendation to approve the strategy for administering the LUCA program is requested.

Discussion:

- If COMPASS were to take the lead, would extracurricular efforts be done to include those agencies not present at this meeting in order to participate in the data sharing (i.e., Kuna and Nampa)?
- Garden City does not have the resources to participate so Option 2 would be more favorable.
- The same holds true for the City of Middleton.
- Option 2 indicates that COMPASS will perform the LUCA address review. Does COMPASS have the staff to review addresses for both counties?

Carl replied that COMPASS has allotted approximately 56 work days for the LUCA program. That may, or may not be enough hours to cover the addressing for both counties. If the cities want COMPASS to take the lead, and the time allotted is not sufficient, COMPASS will have to prioritize and select specific areas where there are, as an example, change in addressing due to new construction. Another consideration; do other cities want to take a lead on their specific jurisdiction to free up more time for a more thorough review of those cities that do not have the resources?

- Is an Option 3 then being considered where cities will do their own addressing and COMPASS will pick up the slack?

Carl replied that an Option 3 could be a hybrid for those cities that want to do their own addressing. It needs to be established now so that COMPASS would not take an active role in gathering those addresses.

- A more streamline and coherent methodology will return the best results. If Option 2 is preferred, will member agencies receive a detailed methodology?

Carl suggested the possibility that COMPASS could coordinate census efforts through a LUCA review team, which could be comprised of an ad-hoc subcommittee of RGAC. This subcommittee could meet as a group or individually with COMPASS, as needed, where a methodology could be drafted as to how the addresses would be reviewed or, how to prioritize address gathering if there were not enough work days allocated for this task.

Ross stated that if Option 2 were selected, the cities that interested in involvement, to whatever level (detailed or hands-off), would be well informed of the process.

- The City of Eagle would be in favor of Option 1 but will have more of an opinion after getting a better idea on the time involvement.

Carl asked if the committee would be willing to indicate which option they would favor at this time. LUCA training is scheduled for October 17, 2007 in Caldwell and October 18, 2007 in Boise.

Ross suggested based on today's discussion, that this committee could recommend to support a coordinated effort in conducting the LUCA program with a caveat that the exact level of coordination would be determined as a census program and methodology becomes focused.

- Since the Ada County engineer does the addressing for Ada County addresses and Garden City, Eagle, and Star, a decision should be made for all four of those entities. Confirmation will be needed from the Ada County engineer as to his level of involvement.

After further discussion, *Bill Vaughan moved and Tina Fenske seconded to recommend support of a coordinated effort in conducting the LUCA program with a caveat that the exact level of coordination would be determined as a census program and methodology becomes focused.*

Discussion:

- What is the deadline for forwarding the member agencies' Option choice?

Ross replied the deadline for an emailed consensus by the committee is October 26, 2007.

- What is COMPASS' preference regarding this effort? Can COMPASS acquire more workdays if needed?

Ross stated that it is COMPASS' desire to have a coordinated process.

- With the coordinated effort and based upon the constraints of Title 13, how much assistance can be obtained from the member agencies in providing information?

Carl replied that within the guidelines of Title 13, there will be one registered editor of LUCA address data. If the 50-plus workdays are not sufficient to obtain address data in both counties, member agencies may be able to help prioritize which areas are looked at first.

Bill Vaughn moved and Chad Lynch seconded to amended the motion to add October 26, 2007 as the deadline for an email consensus by the committee.

Discussion:

- Will COMPASS staff do a follow-up with those cities that are not present at this meeting?

Ross replied that COMPASS staff will do a follow-up.

After further discussion regarding the training schedule, *Chair Bentley called for the vote on the motion and amendment to the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.*

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. 2010 Ortho Photography Project

Ross Dodge reviewed the status of the 2010 Ortho Photography Project. Ross stated that questions were emailed to the committee regarding how frequently this data should be updated, budgeting process, etc. Several responses were received but many have not responded. Responses to questions are requested from members who did not submit their answers.

Ross stated that from the responses received, the timing of the 2010 Ortho Photograph Project seems to work for most agencies. Regarding the update cycle, there were a mixture of responses. One agency was not convinced that they want regular updates and for another agency the two to three year cycle worked. One agency wanted it every two years. There seemed to be support of the Enterprise Fund as long as they are free to use the information as they see fit. A suggestion was made to lease the data.

Regarding budgeting, which ultimately will be decided upon by the COMPASS Finance Committee, one agency preferred the annual budget option because they are not committed to regular updates, another agency did not know if they could afford the project itself, and another agency supported either option but felt that since not all participants in the projects are COMPASS members, the annual budget option would be the better option.

Regarding imagery resolution, the 6" and 1' seems to work as no one would need a higher resolution. More detail is needed regarding the spreadsheet and map. Data needs in addition to ortho photography (i.e., contours, water features, building footprints, etc.) would be supported depending on the cost involved.

Ross stated he would like to talk to those agencies who have not responded in order to get a sense on where their respective jurisdiction stands on these issues. Ross stated a more complete profile will be presented at the next RGAC meeting in order to have a more in-depth discussion.

B. How GIS Data is Used

Ross Dodge stated a questionnaire was emailed to the committee that included a series of questions related to how GIS is used in each committee member's respective jurisdiction. Three responses were received.

Ross presented COMPASS' draft *Communities in Motion* Performance Monitoring Report.

Ross reviewed the responses received:

- City of Nampa: use GIS to review all the aspects of their parcel information, including zoning, ownership, and lot size. Impediments keep information up to date and entered into GIS. Questions being asked: number of housing units by size and type by year, the number of vacant and buildable lots, inventory of dwelling sizes, and inventory of land acreage by zoning type.
- Garden City: use GIS for 300' radius notices. Impediments are the fact that their planning department does not have a GIS software license. Data needs: live to work ratio, habitat wetlands data, and square footage.
- City of Meridian: questions being asked – inventory of preliminary lots along with multi-family and companies involved in the project, and location of low-income housing.

Ross distributed a CD of Regional Geographic information that COMPASS created. Ross requested that RGAC members take this information back to their respective agencies, share it with others and provide feedback on its usefulness.

Chad Lynch stated he would be interested in seeing the role that COMPASS plays as the provider of all that information to all the agencies and suggested COMPASS provide that through internet access and not by CD.

OTHER

A. *Next Meeting:* Thursday, January 17, 2008, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

T:\FY08\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RGAC\Minutes\minutes100407.docx