

Land Use Work Group Meeting Minutes

Date / time 2/24/2017 3:30 PM | Location LCDC Hearing Room, 835 Capitol St. NE, Salem, OR

Meeting called by Robert Mansolillo & Bill Clingman
Type of meeting Work group
Facilitator Robert Mansolillo
Note taker
Zoom meeting <https://zoom.us/j/536386222>
Dial +1 888 683 5191
Meeting ID 536 386 222

Materials:

1. Use Case Summary and Matrix (posted on gis.oregon.gov's Land Use/Land Cover FIT page)
2. METRO - see list provided by METRO
3. SLUCM (1967 or 1968) By Housing and Urban Development's Bureau of Public Housing and Transportation Coding System - it was very detailed, used a nested hierarchy of codes. Good coding system but too detailed for sustained GIS upkeep.
4. Zoning crosswalk scheme for moving local zones into a statewide zoning classification.

Please bring:

1. your specific land use attribute requirements (or send in advance to Bill and Robert)
2. list of land use categories needed for your use cases, with short descriptions of each
3. final comments on the use cases document

Agenda Items

Topic	Lead	Time allotted
<input type="checkbox"/> Welcome & introductions	Robert	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Identify note taker	Bill	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Review of Use Case and Data Needs Assessment	Bill	30
<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements to Land Use Classification Scheme	all	30
<input type="checkbox"/> Inputs in Addition to Stat Class	Bill	30
<input type="checkbox"/> Next steps	Robert and Bill	15
Total time		115

Attending:

Angela Carnahan* angela.carnahan@state.or.us
Bill Clingman bclingman@lcog.org
Eric Brandt* ebrandt@lcog.org

Jimmy Kagan* Jimmy.Kagan@pdx.edu
Marian Lahav marian.lahav@state.or.us
Matt Williams Matt.WILLIAMS@oregon.gov

Nick Seigal	nseigal@lcoog.org	Steven Aalbers	steven.aalbers@state.or.us
Robert Mansolillo	robert.mansolillo@state.or.us	Tanya Haddad*	tanya.haddad@state.or.us
Sarah Marvin*	smarvin@dlcd.state.or.us	Theresa Burcsu	theresa.burcsu@oregon.gov
Stephen Lucker	stephen.lucker@state.or.us	Andy Lanier*	andy.lanier@state.or.us

* Participated by phone

NOTES:

Review of Use Case and Data Needs Assessment - Bill Clingman

Bill noted that LCOG has been looking for clear guidance from potential users, such as specific attributes required or desired. Among the specific attributes identified by users in the use case (available from the LULC web page), Bill noted that:

- Hazards uses may be better suited for Hazards FIT work effort
- Dams, reservoirs are better suited for Land Use WG effort

Several questions arose about what attributes and designations would be included in LCOG's product(s) and the geometries or features that might be represented.

Q: How will zoning be addressed in the new layer? Comprehensive plans?

A: Not addressed by this working group's effort.

Q: Is vertical integration of zoning and land use likely?

A: Topological, probably not, but categorically, there is strong potential for this.

Marian noted that the definition of "land use" can be complex. Comprehensive plans can nest in zoning. Comprehensive plans document land uses.

Bill clarified that the project is focused on the *current land use* which is distinct from *zoned use* or *comprehensive plan designated use*. See the Use Case Document for definitions of these terms.

Tanya noted that tax lots are the key [to a land use layer] and wondered about when large parcels contain multiple land uses. Bill responded that creating geometries smaller than the tax lot can be problematic, particularly when the boundaries change. Tanya suggested that the layer could use national level land cover and derived products such as impervious surfaces as another data source. A discussion followed in which several issues were raised about incongruities between source data and what is actually happening on the ground.

- Nick noted that some uses are occurring in places they shouldn't be [and that these are evident in imagery]
- Matt noted that parcels are sometimes shifted.
- Bill noted that DEQ identified several different types of risk assessments than described in the matrix distributed for 2/10/2017 meeting related to "ownership" and its depiction in the land use layer. Steve Albers elaborated that local government ownership is important to DEQ because it influences the type of recommendations DEQ can make and do make.

Q: Will parcels of the same land use be dissolved together? This could present issues related to public sharing of parcels.

A: It is worth following up on with Cadastral FIT and ORMAP contracts to address issues with public sharing of parcels

Someone called attention to spatial gaps in the data and that it would be nice to address data gaps or holes in the data. Bill has experience doing this for other data. Nick noted that features such as transportation polygons "blow-up" a GIS.

- ****Was suggested that the data include more than one product: a detailed version [that is true to tax lot boundaries and data sources] and a generalized version
- Theresa suggested that the Framework community would benefit from coordinated solutions for issues such as parcel shifting

Action items:

- All participants will review other Framework themes for available data elements (e.g., dams and reservoirs are in different FITs) to ensure the most simple and usable single land use layer.
- Bill will consider creating a new use case for DEQ risk assessments called "contaminant risk assessments".
- All participants: Please submit comments on use cases ASAP

Suggestions made during the discussion (summary):

- following up on with Cadastral FIT and ORMAP contracts to address issues with public sharing of parcels
- data include more than one product: a detailed version [that is true to tax lot boundaries and data sources] and a generalized version
- Identify existing data sources for some use cases, especially those that are working as they are or could contribute information to an land use analysis
- Include protocols for addressing geometry issues in the stewardship plan for the data and for ensuring integration across FW themes and data elements.

Improvements to land use classification system

LCOG is looking for specific guidance on desired classes and definitions.

- Bill provided some examples for the group to consider.
- Examples:
 - 1) METRO - see list provided by METRO
 - 2) SLUCM (1967 or 1968) By Housing and Urban Development's Bureau of Public Housing and Transportation Coding System - it was very detailed, used a nested hierarchy of codes. Good coding system but too detailed for sustained GIS upkeep.
 - 3) Zoning crosswalk scheme for moving local zones into a statewide zoning classification.

Additions to the Stat Class item - Bill

Bill posed the question, what are the most important things that weren't captured in the Stat Class report? A robust discussion followed in which a number of suggestions relating to a broad array rural land uses were identified:

- Bill noted that an area where there is a real need for [land use] classes is in the urban-rural fringe.
- Jimmy suggested that rural residential land uses may not require a highly detailed set of classes and can rely on land cover in part when populating rural parcel land uses.
- Theresa noted that ODA is mapping agland uses at a high level of detail and it is worthwhile to coordinate with ODA.
- Steven A. Said that DEQ could use some detail in rural land uses.
- Parcels may be composed of multiple tax lots. Need to be aware of this.
- There might be an opportunity to produce a statewide set of geometries that local authorities contribute to and then connect to the statewide data set for making changes over time. [TB – an effort like this could be connected to the data sharing bill ([HB 2906](#)) and a means to increase the efficiency of sharing data with the state.]
- There will be issues that are unique to each tax lot source. Solutions such as flagging areas or relying on sources to remove them may be useful.
- Marian suggested that METRO's classes COMMUNITY, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, COMMUNICATIONS be disaggregated into multiple classes. E.g., community - DLCD and hazard mitigation planning are interested in places that house vulnerable populations. Communications - communication towers vs. something else.
- Bill suggested that some of the uses Marian identified may be available from other data, such as "critical structures" data. DOGAMI is working on this to some extent, PREP-FIT also. An issue is that "critical" has multiple meanings. Uses like "education" might be contained in other data, such as DHS's Schools data. The land use layer will help a user identify where to go for more data, such as the DHS schools layer.
- Rural and rangeland uses need to be defined.
 - Farm vs. forest, for example
 - Industrial vs. private forest types
 - Question: integrate ODF private forest parcels or not? If there is a steward for the data
- How do we distinguish between "urban" and "rural"? Depends. Zoning layer?
- Verification protocols? QAQC protocols

Recommendations/suggestions (summary):

- Rural residential classes need to be formulated
- Some classes need to be split (e.g., METRO's community, multi-family residential)
- Need to fill holes in the data somehow.

Action items:

Bill to follow up with ODF on the private forest land parcels layer. Is the layer being maintained? Does it have a steward? should it be integrated into the land use layer?

LCOG to look at OpenRefine (Google tool) for cleaning tabular data. (Tanya is a contact for this tool)

Next steps:

1. LCOG to work with data to develop a proposed classification scheme for review and comment by the work group by early April.
2. LCOG to review meeting notes for additional suggestions and guidance on classification scheme.
3. All work group participants to provide comments on use cases and alter use cases based on review of other existing data that provide sufficient information and may not need to be in a land use layer.