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Topics

- Address Theme Background and Update
- NAD Pilot Update
- NAD Federal User Requirements Workshop
Roles and Responsibilities

- **Executive Champions**
  - DOT – Steve Lewis
  - Census Bureau – Tim Trainor

- **Address Theme Leads**
  - DOT – Steve Lewis
  - Census Bureau – Lynda Liptrap

- **Address Theme Subcommittee**
  - DOT – Steve Lewis
  - Census Bureau – Mark Lange

- **NAD Dataset Manager**
  - Census Bureau – Matt Zimolzak

- **NAD Technology Operations Manager**
  - DOT – Steve Lewis
Address Theme and NAD Goals

- Establish Address Subcommittee
- Develop Theme Definition
- Gather and Refine NAD User Requirements
- Establish Theme Community on the GeoPlatform
- Finalize Subcommittee Charter – in progress
- Assess the DOT Pilot NAD Database
- Develop a Theme Strategic Plan
## 16 Agency Subcommittee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Bureau</td>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>National Technical Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Address Subcommittee

## 25+ Non-federal Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Arkansas</td>
<td>State of North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>State of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>National States Geographic Information Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Massachusetts</td>
<td>State of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>Oakland County, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Minnesota</td>
<td>City of Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Montana</td>
<td>Urban and Regional Information Systems Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of State 911 Administrators</td>
<td>State of Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of New Jersey</td>
<td>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAD Update
Pilot Participants Compiled Into NAD Schema
Coalition of the Willing

- Since the release of the minimum content guidelines and schema, 15 additional address programs volunteered to develop their own ETLs
  - District of Columbia
  - New Jersey
  - Ohio
  - Utah
  - Virginia
  - 9 additional counties and 1 city from Missouri (Locals Helping Locals)

- Recently received data from Colorado, Indiana and Montana (not yet loaded into NAD)

- Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington are in the queue

- Seeking other volunteers through NSGIC
22.3 Million Addresses

Legend
- Data from NAD Pilot
- Data Received, Not Integrated
- States in Queue
What’s Next

- Continue the Coalition of the Willing
- Choose platforms for development and production
- Identify funding for continued development
- Make the data available!
NAD Federal User Requirements Workshop
Workshop Process

- Pre-workshop questionnaire
  - Content
  - Metadata
  - Functional

- Presentations
  - Address theme management and NAD background
  - Results from the questionnaire

- Breakout sessions
  - Review questionnaire results
  - Add requirements if necessary
  - Prioritize requirements

- Summary of breakout sessions
Content Requirements

- Key take-away points
  - Federal agencies identified additional requirements
  - NAD Pilot minimum content met the needs of many Federal agencies

- Top five additional content requirements
  - Alternate street names
  - Unit type
  - Postal City/State abbreviation
  - Multi-unit structure flag
  - Geocode confidence and accuracy
Metadata Requirements

❖ Key take-away
  ❖ Top three needs are essential, remaining are desirable

❖ Top five metadata requirements
  ❖ Address coordinate reference system
  ❖ Coordinate reference system authority
  ❖ Indicator of quality
  ❖ Unique IDs
  ❖ Address lifecycle
Functional Requirements

- Key take-away points
  - Bulk download serves 90% of agencies needs
  - Functionality beyond tools on Geospatial Platform would be useful

- Top five functional requirements
  - Feedback mechanisms
    - Error correction
    - Functionality development
  - Download tools such as subset download, queuing
  - Anytime access via cloud
  - Batch geocoding service
  - Ability to feed updates to classified systems
Additional Workshop Topics

- Overall workflow
  - Maintenance
- Quality
- Unique IDs
- Linkages to other datasets
  - Infrastructure points (manholes, fire hydrants)
  - Building footprints, parcels, etc.
Next Steps

- Produce report of workshop findings with recommendations

- Continue discussions on NAD and address topics at monthly Address Subcommittee meetings
NAD Challenges

- Resources needed to host the Pilot NAD
- Currently no funding for NAD development and support
- Need funding strategies for NAD development and support beginning in FY19
Address Theme and NAD Team Contacts

Steve Lewis
steve.lewis@dot.gov
202-366-9223

Lynda Liptrap
lynda.a.liptrap@census.gov
301-763-1058

Mark Lange
mark.lange@census.gov
301-763-2660

Matt Zimolzak
matthew.a.zimolzak@census.gov
301-763-9419
Pre-Workshop Questionnaire Preliminary Results

Federal Agency Uses for NAD

- Address Verification/Inventory: 10
- Decision-Making/Policy Development: 8
- Planning: 7
- Emergency Response: 6
- Impact Analysis: 4
- Fraud Detection: 4
- Other: 4
- Survey Execution: 3
- Service Delivery: 3
- Facility Management: 3
- Risk Assessment: 2
- Mailing List: 2
- Funding Allocation: 2
- Compliance Notification: 1
- Enumeration: 1

number of responses
Examples of Pre-Workshop Responses

Address Point Location
- Front Door Only: 3 responses
- Building Footprint Centroid: 2 responses
- Parcel Centroid: 2 responses
- No Preference: 1 response
- All Doors: 1 response
- Post Office Mail Receptacle: 1 response

Update Frequency
- Annually: 6 responses
- Quarterly: 3 responses
- Continuously: 2 responses
- Biannually: 1 response

Address Type
- Residential: 10 responses
- Commercial: 6 responses
- Governmental/Public: 4 responses
- Other: 2 responses

Data Management Model
- No Preference: 6 responses
- Distributed: 4 responses
- Centralized: 2 responses