

# Notes

## Administrative Boundaries FIT Planning Workgroup



**Meeting Date:** June 27, 2012

**Time:** 1:30-3:00pm

**Location:** DLCD, Salem

**Attendees:** Brian Hanes, Washington County \* = via phone  
Milt Hill, DAS/GEO  
John Boyd, Douglas County\*  
Randy Dana, DLCD\*  
Dawn Smith, Wallowa County\*  
Bill Clingman, LCOG\*  
Rob Denner, City of Philomath  
Katherine Daniels, DLCD  
Chad Crockett, ODOT  
Steve Lucker, DLCD  
Doug Terra, City of Eugene\*  
Zac Christensen, Metro\*  
Gail Ewart, DLCD

Gail welcomed everyone, followed by a round of introductions.

Gail briefly described how this workgroup is a part of the Administrative Bnds FIT and has been tasked with UGB, Zoning, and Comprehensive Plan map elements within the Planning cluster. The body of work includes standards to the extent the umbrella standard does not go far enough, data collection and gradual statewide compilation, and stewardship design and documentation.

A status of each element was requested.

- 1) UGBs are already a Framework data set thanks to years of work by Angela Lazarean. The metadata for the 2011 version has finally been approved. Posting on the geospatial clearinghouse as Framework is imminent. Stewardship needs to be documented. Several echoed a concern about the lag between a city's new UGB and when a LUBA appeal is settled, making it an acknowledged boundary. A suggestion was made to maintain two versions until the LUBA decision is issued.
- 2) The only statewide zoning data set is old and generalized. Nothing considered Framework exists. We will need to start from the beginning. (Extensive discussion on zoning data, business needs, etc.; see below.)
- 3) Comprehensive Plan Maps also need to start from scratch. Some people consider them less of a priority than zoning. [Description of discussion follows that of zoning.]

### Zoning Discussion

Metro has a common zoning language it uses across all of the jurisdictions within its boundary. The crosswalk generalizes the local zoning codes and the local codes are maintained untouched in the

finished seamless data set, along with the geometry. The economics unit and planners decide how to aggregate up (put the codes into common bins). The definitions are documented. Metro needs this for cross-jurisdiction planning, such as transportation corridors. Zac and Dennis will tell us all about how they integrate zoning at our next meeting.

Many questions and concerns were expressed about developing and maintaining a statewide zoning data set, including

- Misuse of the data—Disclaimers can help put people on notice; Framework has a general disclaimer applied to all of the elements. Nothing can prevent people from doing inappropriate things with data.

- State or multiple versions of data may cause confusion or bad decisions

- Loss of local detail

- How to disseminate notice of zoning changes

Suggestion to make a list of objections and be ready to provide a solid response.

**Action:** Generate and maintain a list of issues, objections, and concerns (**Gail** will initiate)

Business needs for zoning

- DLCD needs it to help evaluate the land use planning program, aggregate data statewide, look at trends, and identify areas where something is working well; also, respond to Legislative inquiries and evaluate policy changes

- Metro uses it for forecasting and trans-jurisdiction planning

Gail sees us starting out slow and easy, with a pilot and building on a core of contributing governments over several years until a statewide data set is achieved. ETL routines and consumption of Web services will assure a light touch on contributors. We'll first concentrate on getting locals to contribute the data and make it available in one place. Database integration can happen after we have worked out how best to do it.

One way to phase the approach is starting out highly generalized, say fewer than ten classes.

Property class codes are a possible model for methodology. Subject matter is current land use, which belongs in the LU/LC FIT. We would look at the class codes for how the codes are maintained, evolved and communicated, etc. DOR would know about how this is done; perhaps Dean Anderson also.

**Actions:** Bill and Dawn to send links regarding property class codes. Gail will contact Dean Anderson and/or Mark Kinslow about the property class methodology for possible August presentation.

DOGAMI has excellent process for generalizing geology mapping; depends on good definitions; committee meets to agree on generalizations. This is another potential good model, although zoning codes are less definitive than geologic ones.

### Comprehensive Plan Maps

Reported that 80% of rural jurisdictions are still on mylar for their maps. Brief discussion on whether this is still the case.

**Action:** Milt will ask Dave Snyder about the state of data in low population areas (Milt)

Questions about why the state, local, regional governments care about this data. Not even sure what the difference is between zoning and comp plan maps from a mapping standpoint. Lots of local govts maintain combo zoning/plan layers. There are overlaps in the UGB between city and county plan maps. Properly aligning multiple map layers is a big challenge. Vertical stewardship is designed to manage those issues. Example is roads, bridges, and hydrography.

Differentiation: Comprehensive plans provide policy guidance and zoning implements the policy/plan. Lane County implements their comp plan thru their generalized zoning data.

Meeting housekeeping:

Frequency: Bimonthly

Duration: Two hours

Location: Salem mostly, but some variation

Next Meeting: August at Metro in Portland, two hours

Zoning Integration

Property Class Codes methodology

Next steps

**Action:** Gail to set up Doodle poll for August meeting, coordinating with Metro for the demo (Zac/Dennis); Milt to set up iLinc session.