

Idaho Technology Authority (ITA)

## Idaho Geospatial Council – Executive Committee

Meeting Minutes: August 21, 2014

*(Approved November 7, 2014)*

The August 21, 2014 meeting of the Idaho Geospatial Council – Executive Committee was held at 9:30 a.m. in Room B09 (Basement), LBJ Building, 650 W. State St., Boise, Idaho.

### ATTENDANCE

#### **Members/Alternate(s) Present:**

Anne Kawalec, Chair, Ada County Assessor's Office  
Bill Farnsworth, Office of the CIO  
Laurie Ames, Nez Perce Tribe (phone)  
Wendy Hawley, U.S. Census Bureau (phone)  
Jerry Korol, NRCS  
Bruce Godfrey, University of Idaho (VTC)  
Frank Roberts, Innovate! (phone)  
Keith Weber, ISU GIS Center (phone)  
Donna Phillips, City of Hayden (phone)  
Brynn Lacabanne, ITD District 3  
Wilma Robertson, Tax Commission  
Joel Hall, Blaine County (phone)  
Dennis Hill, City of Pocatello (phone)  
Brian Liberty, Idaho Power

#### **Others Present:**

Erin Seaman, Office of the CIO  
Danielle Favreau, Dept. of Water Resources  
Bill Reynolds, Nez Perce Tribe (phone)  
Donna Pitzer, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Coy Chapman, Ada County Assessor  
Jack Clark, Idaho Society of Prof. Land Surveyors  
Bob Smith, Office of the CIO  
Don Watts, Ada County Assessor

### WELCOME

Ms. Kawalec (Chair) welcomed everyone, and introductions were made.

### MINUTES

**MOTION: Mr. Farnsworth moved and Mr. Korol seconded a motion to approve the May 22, 2014 minutes; the motion passed unanimously.**

### LEGAL DEFINITION OF LAND SURVEYING

Coy Chapman, licensed PLS and Land Records analyst for the Ada County Assessor, is working with the Idaho Society of Professional Land Surveyors to update the legal definition of land surveying in Idaho Code. He updated the committee on their progress.

**Mr. Farnsworth asked if this draft of the updated definition had been sent out to the counties.**

Mr. Clark confirmed that it had been sent to the Idaho Association of Counties, as well as the Association of Idaho Cities, among others.

**Mr. Liberty asked where right-of-way easements fell within the authoritative descriptions for land ownership, and whether Idaho Power's right-of-way maps could be approved by surveyors.**

Mr. Clark responded that surveyors needed to approve right-of-way maps, noting that, like any other design function, there is an approval process.

**Mr. Hill asked what had been corrected with this revised edition.**

Mr. Chapman explained that the feedback they received when they made their original presentation last year was that their intent had not gotten across, and Ms. Favreau commented that she didn't think that what they were trying to address was a GIS/surveyor problem, but rather a problem in the definition as far as the profession was concerned, and that the law didn't currently recognize all that they do.

**Ms. Pitzer asked what the next step would be.**

Mr. Clark explained that they were working on the suggested language, and the next step was to submit final comments to the Registration Board, and then it would be submitted to the Governor's Office and the Legislative Services Office, with the goal of getting the bill passed during the 2015 Legislative session.

Mr. Clark explained that, ideally, comments would be submitted from the GIS community, and once the final bill was out the IGC-EC would provide a letter of support. He noted that they were actively discussing this with legislators, and working on finding a sponsor for the bill.

**HYDROGRAPHY DATASET NOMINATION**

Ms. Favreau presented two Hydrography dataset nominations for the Hydrography Framework. She explained that the Hydrography TWG planned to present the nominations at the November IGC-EC and IGC meetings. Information on both nominations would be posted on the Idaho Department of Water Resources website and the GIS website, and would be sent to the IGC-EC members and the geotech listserv. Ms. Favreau stated that no vote was being sought today, and she requested that they be forwarded to the TWG for further discussion. She provided a brief overview of the two nominations:

1. Hydrography Dataset of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) – Water Features portion of the TIM Framework
2. Watershed Boundary Dataset (WBD) – Catchment portion of the TIM Framework

**Mr. Liberty asked what types of feature classes were in the hydrography dataset, and who maintained the accuracy of the data. He also asked if this would be the authoritative dataset for canals.**

Ms. Favreau responded that the NHD was a full geometric network with all the related tables, and was a true, complex dataset. The USGS maintains the accuracy of that data through the data stewards. She confirmed that it would be the authoritative dataset for canals, but with some level of delay.

**Ms. Kawalec requested that both nominations be sent to the Hydrography TWG for further review and to discuss the exclusions. The next Hydrography TWG meeting was scheduled for September 18.**

In response to a question from Mr. Liberty, Ms. Favreau explained that the NHD was a national dataset, and the only thing she would expect Idaho to recognize is that the portion of the dataset in Idaho would be recognized as the TIM. Ms. Favreau commented that the hydrography framework was unique, in that hydrography has a national dataset, which is being adapted to the statewide framework.

**Ms. Robertson asked whether exclusions applied to nominations in general. She commented that perhaps exclusions should be part of a nomination, and asked if that was an IGC-EC topic, or if this was something that could be discussed during the Hydrography TWG meeting.**

Ms. Favreau responded that exclusions to these nominations would be discussed at the TWG meeting.

Ms. Kawalec stated that this question had not been addressed when the guidelines were put together, and that it might be a good idea to look at those again.

**Ms. Kawalec requested that the Hydrography TWG discuss the exclusions, and asked to have this added as a discussion item during the next IGC-EC meeting for perhaps getting the group together again to include exclusions in the guideline.**

**SOILS TWG DISCUSSION**

Jerry Korol gave a presentation on the history of the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), as well as an overview of the NRCS Soils Database, and some options for hosting the data, if it were to be selected, noting that there were reasons why it may not be. He outlined the current data structure, and explained how it was stored nationally. Mr. Korol also discussed the structure of the soil survey area and the soil access database, noting that the metadata is complete nationwide and is updated as needed.

Mr. Korol presented a map of the current soil data, noting that there were areas on the map in which their dataset does not contain data. He explained that NRCS looks at agricultural data and agricultural soils, not forest soils, and that the U.S. Forest Service and Parks Service controlled the data for forest soils. He explained that the drawback to this dataset for the TIM is that it is not statewide, and noted that the soil survey area boundaries don't necessarily match the county boundaries.

Discussion followed and Mr. Korol asked the committee if they would like to create a Soils TWG to study the data.

**Ms. Pitzer asked if the Soils TWG would work on creating an Idaho-wide dataset.**

Mr. Korol responded that the TWG would not do that, and he wondered if that dataset was even worth considering by the TWG, or if there is such a gap in the data that it would not make it as a state dataset.

Several comments were made that those were decisions that the TWG should make, and that while the vision of having statewide datasets from border to border would never happen, this would still be worthy of putting a TWG together to look at further.

Ms. Favreau commented that whether or not the Forest Service data could be incorporated needed to be documented. She also noted that her understanding was that the Idaho Geological Survey (IGS) had several soil surveys as well, and it would be beneficial to have a local IGS staff member come in to talk about it. She stated that she was not discounting the NRCS dataset, but believed that everyone needed to be given an opportunity to present their datasets for consideration.

Discussion followed, with some concern expressed regarding the possibility of having multiple authoritative datasets, but it was agreed that the formation of a Soils TWG would be beneficial, and would provide an avenue for documenting why multiple datasets might be recognized.

**MOTION: Mr. Farnsworth moved and Ms. Robertson seconded a motion to create a Soils TWG; the motion passed unanimously.**

At the request of Ms. Kawalec, Mr. Korol agreed to chair the newly formed Soils TWG.

**PARCEL PROJECT UPDATE**

Mr. Farnsworth gave a brief update on the Parcel Project. He explained that the Beta website and the production website were both completed, but that the production site was not yet live. Mr. Farnsworth noted that there are now 15 signed agreements in place.

**Ms. Kawalec asked if the data is updated.**

Mr. Farnsworth responded that he has some updated data from the counties, but it's still in the raw, unprocessed format.

**Ms. Kawalec asked how many of these counties were charging for the data. She explained that she thought some of the counties, like Ada County, were not charging for the data.**

Mr. Farnsworth responded that so far, the counties he has had conversations with are charging for the data, although there were a couple of counties where it was unclear whether they were charging or not. Only a few counties responded to his request for information on this. Mr. Farnsworth explained that for the comprehensive set, there would be a separate, conditional agreement.

Ms. Kawalec clarified that Ada County didn't need another agreement with Access Idaho because of the way the original MOA was written. If there were to be a charge, a separate agreement would be made with Access Idaho. However, Ada County was not charging for data, so this didn't apply.

Mr. Reynolds noted that Nez Perce County charged a penny a record for the full dataset, and would likely participate in any conversations about whether there should be a charge on the dataset coming from the state.

**Ms. Robertson recommended clarifying the disclaimer on the site regarding “citizen notification of events in the area.”**

Mr. Farnsworth confirmed that he would update the site and use the language contained in the agreement with the counties, as well as cite Idaho Statute.

**Mr. Godfrey asked if the information was going to be captured every six months, or yearly, or if it was going to be just the most recent information that is available.**

Mr. Farnsworth responded that the most recent information would be available, and that internally, at least one version back would be saved, so that if someone bought the comprehensive data for a county, and then lost it, it could be replaced. Users would be able to re-download what they originally downloaded. However, when new versions come out, users will not have a choice between multiple versions or files.

Ms. Kawalec suggested that all updates be done every six months, in January and July, in order to be consistent.

Ms. Kawalec explained that users would establish an account when they used this. If there was no charge, users would simply check-out and download, and if there were charges, users would be asked for their credit card information. She noted that there was a \$4 fee charged by Access Idaho for downloading the comprehensive data, and this charge was separate from what a county may charge.

In response to a question from Ms. Robertson, Mr. Farnsworth explained that when he uploads the files, he checks off the components included in the dataset so that users know which ones are there for a particular county. If a county requests a report of everyone who has downloaded their dataset, he will be able to supply basic information, and this can be modified going forward.

**Ms. Phillips asked if she would be able to download as many versions of a comprehensive dataset as she wanted to if she paid for it, and if these could be downloaded by all of her agency’s offices for that one-time fee, multiple times over the course of the year.**

Ms. Kawalec responded that she assumed if a person paid for, and downloaded data, they would be able to share it with others in their agency as many times as they wanted to since it was paid for. However, she noted that this was a trial.

#### **ArcGIS PROJECT UPDATE**

Mr. Farnsworth updated the committee on the ArcGIS Online project. The site was recently launched and can be found at: [www.maps.idaho.gov](http://www.maps.idaho.gov). He noted that it wasn’t economically feasible for agencies to purchase licenses individually, but by purchasing the licenses together, the cost has dropped from \$400 per user to \$200 per user. There are now 35 agencies using it, with 100 user licenses currently.

Mr. Farnsworth explained that since this was a self-service model, it was important that new users be guided and supported by GIS professionals otherwise the quality of the maps could be lost. Mr. Farnsworth noted that there were samples of some of the maps that have been created, and there are now 400+ map services out there, which are usable on all ArcGIS Online desktop applications.

**Mr. Liberty asked for clarification on how he would know where and when the layers came from when doing a search, since there are 400+ services out there.**

Mr. Farnsworth responded that an account has been created which is called “State of Idaho”. Once a layer is received, it is verified and then the ownership is changed to the “State of Idaho” account. He

shared a sample of one of the maps, and noted that new users have been invited to training labs, where they have been able to bring their own computers and their own data and learn more about this tool.

**INVENTORY OF MAP SERVICES AND LOCATIONS**

With time running short, Mr. Farnsworth requested that this agenda item be tabled until the next meeting.

**TRANSPORTATION PILOT PROJECT**

Ms. Kawalec explained that Dennis Hill and Craig Rindlisbacher, who had planned to present on this topic, had asked to table this agenda item until the next meeting.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

IGC FALL MEETING PLANNING – Ms. Kawalec shared that the next IGC-EC and IGC meetings were being planned for November in Boise, with the date and location to be announced. The IGC-EC meeting would be in the morning, with the IGC meeting to follow. Ms. Kawalec also noted that with ArcGIS Pro coming out soon, Esri had also been contacted to see if they would be coming to town.

**ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING**

The meeting adjourned at 11:33 a.m. The next meeting was being planned for November, with the date and location to be announced.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Erin Seaman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Seaman, Office of the CIO