<u>Meeting Notes</u>
FGDC Address Subcommittee
January 11, 2017
U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC

<u>In-person and On-line Attendance (25 total)</u>:

Florinda Balfour, Department of Veteran Affairs
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, Census Bureau
Mike Byrne, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Jennifer Carlino, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC)
Stephanie Crews-Jones, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Fharon Hicks, U.S. Postal Service
Mark Holmes, State of Michigan
Jamie Huang, Office of Management and Budget
David Jackson, District of Columbia
Christian Jacqz, State of Massachusetts (Next Generation 911)
Mark Lange, Census Bureau
Steve Lewis, U.S. Department of Transportation
Lynda Liptrap, Census bureau
Susan Moore, Oakland County, Michigan
Karen Poole, Census Bureau
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Doug Schleifer, State of New Jersey
Joe Sewash, State of North Carolina
Tina Smith, Department of Justice
Diane Snediker, Census Bureau
Jason Warzinik, Boone County, Missouri
Ed Wells, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority (WMATA), Washington, DC (URISA)
Martha Wells, Spatial Focus, Urban and Regional Information Systems Association (URISA)
Sara Yurman, Spatial Focus
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

<u>Meeting Summary:</u>

After brief introductions, subcommittee co-chairs Mark Lange (Census Bureau) and Steve Lewis (DOT) thanked everyone for their review of the Address Theme Definition. The 'URISA version' definition that resulted from discussions at the December 16, 2016 kick-off meeting was circulated to the Subcommittee in December and the subcommittee members and partners provided constructive feedback that collectively raised four main points: (1) clarifying that addresses are tied to a *geographic* location, (2) some confusion around Linear Reference Locations and Transportation Network Identifiers, (3) simplifying and clarifying what is *not* in the Theme (i.e., occupants, addressees, email, parcels, IP addresses), and (4) the definition's relationship to the FGDC Address Standard. Accounting for these four points, the subcommittee co-chairs proposed a revised definition prior to today's meeting and the subcommittee engaged in a broad ranging discussion.

Some of the issues raised during the discussion of the Address Theme Definition:

- **Length of the definition:** Several members reiterated a need for a "shorter and concise" or "broader" and more "flexible" definition in lieu of "long and detailed" descriptions. The Subcommittee agreed with the goal of keeping the definition consistent with other theme definitions; therefore, the sentence on the geographic scope (i.e., United States and U.S. Territory addresses) was removed for consistency.

- **Defining an Address vs an Address Theme**: Some members expressed their concern that the definition should focus more on the theme and not the definition of an address itself. Addresses exist within a system, and therefore require quality checks, rules for assignment, routing, in addition to defining point locations with a street number, name, or coordinate.

- **Terminology:** New terminology was introduced to summarize some of the specific concerns raised in the existing proposals (e.g., data elements, metadata, and attributes). There was some concern about the necessary and basic components of metadata that may be missing from a data submission. In general, addresses without accompanying metadata will be accepted for use in the National Address Database (NAD), but with a goal to add metadata later. Potentially, other datasets, in addition to a NAD will be included in this theme and the definition should allow for this.

- **Address Theme Community Page References:** Committee members also discussed the development of a Community page for the Address theme. This page will contain the Theme's Charter, additional reference documents, a list of standards, and the FGDC Address Standard. What is not clarified or included in the Address Theme Definition should be explained in these documents.

- **What it Does Not Include**: Parcels should not be included in the definition—also, tools that use addresses vs the address itself. The definition also does not include occupants, addressees, or personally identifiable information (PII).

- **Postal addresses**: The Address Theme Definition should include a reference to a point of postal delivery. The Subcommittee discussed P.O. boxes and postal routes. Points of postal delivery can include the Post office building itself where P.O. boxes are located.

- **Locational Reference Methods**: Subcommittee members discussed ways to strengthen the definition by possibly including reference systems or the typology of location reference systems. Addresses relate to coordinates, names, etc. and refer to the same place. It is useful to frame this definition so that we are building connections to the other locational references. The definition might refer to point features, coordinates, and point reference systems--coordinate pairs, linear features, and/or landmark names—all related to the same location. We need to be able to relate the addresses to point, coordinates, linear reference, or landmark names. These can all be independent entities, not attributes of one entity. The definition needs to refer to locational reference methods succinctly without blooming into a complex definition.

- **Changing the Definition After Adoption:** Concerns were raised about changing the definition if necessary, after it has been approved by the FGDC Coordination Group. Lynda Liptrap acknowledged that there is a process to change the definition if necessary.

New FGDC Address Theme Definition

Addresses are the data elements, attributes, and metadata that specify a fixed geographic location by reference to a thoroughfare or landmark, or specifies a point of postal delivery, or both. The address theme does not include occupants or addressees nor does it include the features (parcels, building footprints, etc.) whose locations may be specified by an address. The theme may include linkages between these features and other location reference methods.

– Address Subcommittee, 1/11/2017

The final definition resulting from the committee discussions was sent to the Address Subcommittee for a review immediately after the meeting followed by a Call to Vote by its 15 voting member agencies (see attached list). If there is an affirmative vote, the definition will be presented to the Theme Leads and FGDC Coordination Group for review.

Subcommittee Discussion of Building a National Address Database (NAD)

- Bottom/Up exercise: Building a NAD is a bottom up vs. top down exercise. The origins of the data, the authority, the metadata, the attributes, content guidelines, etc. become important in building a database. There needs to be a distributed process of assigning unique IDs and considerations for data aggregation. Things need to be distributed in this context. A possible quality check going forward could encourage address data submissions.
- NGDA Portfolio: Points and polygon datasets may be included in the NGDA portfolio for this theme. An address may be a polygon. Theme lead, Lynda Liptrap reiterated that we will be building a collection of datasets and/or NGDAs to support the theme. There may be several kinds of data inventories, e.g., telephone poles, but this theme has been envisioned as a largely point feature theme.
- NAD Funding: In FY2017 there is no comprehensive program or agency funding for the NAD. In FY2018 the Census Bureau will propose to fund an initiative. Steve Lewis announced that National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) provided $200K to hire a contract developer to build version 1 of the NAD. This funding will help states to build ETL systems. Currently, 31 states have address data programs in various stages . Version 1 is expected to be done by the end of the calendar year (2017).

Charter:

The basic components of the charter were introduced by Mark Lange. Mark invited Subcommittee members to review the charter and submit comments to him before our next meeting on February 8, 2017. Comments received will be compiled in advance by Mark and shared with Subcommittee members. Members discussed the pros and cons of using a Wiki or Community Page on the GeoPlatform to share comments during the review process. As soon as

the Address Theme Definition is approved by the Coordination Group, a Community Web page on the GeoPlatform can be initiated. This may not happen in time to review the charter however.

Address User Requirements Workshop:

This workshop will be held on **February 21, 2017** at the DOT in Washington, DC from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm. Facilitators will be present to assist with meeting break-out sessions on functional requirements, uses, and metadata. To facilitate the discussion and use of break-out groups, this will be an in-person workshop only and no remote access will be available. A pre-workshop questionnaire will be sent to participants to review use cases and interests.

Member/Partnership feedback:

URISA and NSGIC Members expressed their appreciation for being a part of the discussions of the Address Theme Definition and Charter.

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, **February 8, 2017 1:00 to 2:30 pm** at the **Census Bureau HQ**, Suitland, MD.

Voting Subcommittee Member Agencies for the Address Theme:

Department of Commerce, Census Bureau

Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau

Department of Education

Department of Energy

Department of Homeland Security

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Department of the Interior

Department of Justice

Department of Labor

Office of Management and Budget

U.S. Postal Service

Department of Transportation

Department of Veterans Affairs

Social Security Administration