

1/20/11

## **LULC Meeting Minutes**

(10:00am-11:15am)

### Agenda

1. Overview of LBCS (Bruce)
2. Draft Land Cover Standard progress (Keith)
3. Land use/land tenure pilots (Bob)
4. Discussion
5. Change in the TWG Chair
6. Other items

### In attendance:

Keith Weber, Chris, Bruce, Lori, Bill, Gail, Bob, Bryan, Sonjia, Angie

Keith turns time over to Bruce to discuss agenda item #1. LBCS for years has been working with American Planning Association for classification criterion to define land use classification. Bruce encourages group to look at 2<sup>nd</sup> document posted on website titled: Second Draft Class 1.pdf. This is a 48 page document that gives an introduction and goes over how to use classification standards. He gave a condensed overview on the standards and the theory behind classification and how assigning occurs. No one size fits all when talking about how organizations use classification. There are five categories that define land use: activity, function, structure, site development and ownership. See document for definitions and more complete understanding of LBCS standards. Success will be measured by the needs of the project and the ability to populate tables. This is an ideal structure and depending on the project may be missing needed categories that fit with the specific project and what information is available. The LBCS should be used as a "GO TO" document. Please review also the LBCS Notes from 11/18/10-1. This will show the initial steps for implementation and examples. There are available models and personal databases that can be downloadable. The American Planning Association website can give one a complete package. There are enough tools for evaluation for this product. Look at the schema for defining land use framework provided. This is vital for research and development at each level of your project.

Bruce opens the floor for questions.

Gail states that they are actively using the standard for landmarks (structure & functional) however, it is a modified version suited to them and their needs. There is a potential of pictures being able to feed into this. Gail states that they are actively in correspondence with Trimble (?) and are incorporating new codes. This is flexible & drill down to specifics or the option of staying generalized is there. It is accommodating.

There is some discussion between Bruce and Gail about uses.

Gail discusses large scale classification and is unsure with how this group would consider this. Uses of local government data enabled by the Federal side. State takes advantage of both systems. Modified functional & structure system. Proven to them to be mutually beneficial process as seen in the standard.

To see how this is used at State level visit website Gail will provide the URL to and also consider the Appendix C that was mentioned.

Discussion between Keith and Gail on how well is this going to work with the State parcels framework standard. It is done by a County by County basis and not all use it and there is a variety of approached and it is not always populated.

Keith mentions that it would be good to adopt a Best Practices form. This should be put together to help Counties and gives them recommendations on how they can use LBCS. This would be a good direction for this group to work towards.

Database project addresses issue for local and state and ties huge amounts of data together. The group should do an evaluation and see where needs are. There was 5 years of research and development done by the American Planning Association. Encouraged to use LBCS and other useful components.

Discussion between Chris and Bruce on how to extend to parcels in the future. We are only at a general level. Bruce is hoping that the new system "Blueprint Boise" is adopted in the next few months. Is Compass looking at this from regional standpoint? Yes, but their universe is surrounded by traffic analysis.

Gail states that even with weakness was glad that the plans are pulled together, this has never happened before.

Bruce states that definition is too general and not as meaningful but it is a good first step. Compass has enough to get by but further refinement is needed.

Keith brings up that each member should add this action item to next meeting's agenda. Every member should look at the LBCS standard and consider and evaluate for adoption for Best Practices and be familiar with how this can be implemented.

Keith moves to Agenda Item #2 : Draft Land Cover Standard progress

He is currently revising the document (Oregon Standard) and stripping out very specific ideas. The first draft will cover goals and wants. This will accomplish more longevity so that biannual revisions are not required.

Keith hopes to have the draft available to everyone before the next meeting.

Keith brings up Agenda Item #3.

Bryan at BLM was tasked at last meeting to report on the Forest Service & what the BLM is doing. Gives report. BLM uses the Idaho Land Cover Classification system for planning efforts and datasets. Caribou and Targhee use own datasets. Bryan discusses BLM sending report on this.

Gail states that hard work has been addresses and can this be used in house strictly or can it be made available to this group to consider.

Bryan will check into this.

Oregon Standard Version 1 Dec. 2006 based on template that is the same as Idaho's. NLCD talked about. Jimmy Kagen is over a tiny but powerful agency. He is the best person to talk to about Land Tenure and Land Cover. He is based in Portland.

BLM is willing to use Oregon Standard and will continue to use Idaho Land Cover.

Would like to meld the two together.

Gail another note on Jimmy Kagen is that he uses the term land stewardship and there is a possibility for terminology disconnect.

Bob discusses land use – pilot project. Met with Fish and Game to discuss land management data into GIS. They have an access database with description of lands managed for wildlife habitat.

He has been looking at the raw data. Tracking land tenure.

Sonjia adds that tie their database on what currently is mapped. IDL. To assign protection status to lands.

IDL maps Fish and Game interest property owned outright. They do not cover State ownership. Counties have a number of way of handling the "camera part" not the "geometry part" with records.

Discussion

Start with 930 records. Large parcels should be easy and once completed if worst come to worst a person can take the estimated 600 records and make use of it.

Sonjia we should take the time to tie the information and make sure the tie is maintained. Make sure the id is unique between systems so we don't have to recreate link 5 years in the future.

Chris Clay's idea discussed (granule ).

First sweep should be parcels 40 & above. It is easier to work with this rationale and gives us a place to drawn the line.

Bob with you dig into and report back. Yes, but it will be a cursory overview.

Discuss progress at next meeting.

Keith brings up Agenda Item # 5: TWG Chair

Is there an active member of this group willing to fill the Chair position? Open the floor for discussion. This person would take over the Chair duties. Gail steps forth and commits to talk to people who may be able to fit the position.

Don't want to loose momentum Keith will stay in position while Chair is being looked for and placed.

Mull over and think about best candidate. This person would need to coordinate meetings and set agenda. It would not require an huge amount of time and energy. We will revisit the issue at the next meeting.

Agenda Item #6: Inter Mountain GIS Users Conference is coming up. We could meet as a group at that conference. Gail and Keith for sure are attending.

Meeting closed and Adjourned.