

Meeting Notes
FGDC Address Subcommittee
March 8, 2017
Department of Transportation, Washington, DC

In-person and On-line Attendance (26 total):

Avi Bender, NTIS
Florinda Balfour, VA
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, Census Bureau
Michael Byrne, CFPB
Jennifer Carlino, USGS/FGDC
Michael Fashoway, MT
Ben Gurga, SSA
Mark Holmes, State of Michigan
Christian Jacqz, MA/Next Gen 911
Earl Johnson, USPS
John Koudelka, DOE, Idaho National Laboratory
Mark Lange, Census Bureau
Steve Lewis, DOT
Jerry McMullen, State of Vermont
Ted Okada, FEMA
Donna Pena, State of California
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Doug Schleifer, NJ
Joe Sewash, NC
Jon Sperling, HUD
Jason Warznik, Boone County, Missouri
Ed Wells, Washington Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Martha Wells, Spatial Focus/URISA
Nate Workman, FEMA
Amy Youmans, FEMA
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

Review of Progress on Theme Goals

Mark Lange updated the group on progress made towards several of the subcommittee's goals. The FGDC Coordination Group voted to approve the Address Theme definition on March 3, 2017 and the definition is now out for a vote by the FGDC Steering Committee until March 24, 2017. Once approved, the definition will be published on the FGDC web site. An Address Theme community page has been developed on the GeoPlatform.gov site and meeting announcements and presentations will be added to this page.

Regarding the Subcommittee charter, the subcommittee co-chairs decided to get Census executives input on a draft charter *before* the subcommittee finalizes the charter. The input received on the first draft will be incorporated into the draft that the Subcommittee works on at the April Subcommittee meeting.

After the charter is finalized, remaining items for the Subcommittee include assessing the existing NAD and developing an FGDC Strategic Plan.

NAD Activities at NSGIC Mid-year Meeting

Midyear meeting in Annapolis had NAD and Address theme related sessions and many presenters in the general sessions also mentioned the NAD.

A NAD breakout session was exceptionally good. The breakout session had a good discussion of metadata and indicators of database completeness, possibly as a polygon layer. There was also a good discussion on how to propagate a unique id through the data roll-up process.

Steve Lewis said his overall impression is that there is optimism. We have accomplished a lot and the workshop results were good. The subcommittee raised several points:

- The subcommittee might consider how to include web services as a way to get updated and current data from partners very quickly.
- NAD minimum content guidelines are just that: a guideline not a standard.
- The membership diversity on the subcommittee in terms of the types of organizations represented is nice to see and important.
- NENA has agreed to participate on the Subcommittee.

The Mid-year meeting archive, including notes and presentations, is available on the NSGIC web site (<https://www.nsgic.org/2017-midyear-meeting-archive>).

NAD Federal Requirements Workshop Re-cap

Matt Zimolzak reviewed the recent NAD Federal User Requirements Workshop held at DOT. The workshop was successful in gathering federal agency address database needs beyond the existing minimum content guidelines. A workshop report will be published in early summer.

A pre-workshop questionnaire was distributed to participants to explore the types of uses for the NAD and also helped shape the workshop discussions. Twelve agencies responded to the questionnaire prior to the workshop and several others have submitted responses post-workshop. The questionnaire and workshop were organized around three types of NAD requirements: content, metadata, and functional. Matt summarized several of the questionnaire responses and those will be available in the workshop report and on the FGDC Address Theme web page.

Break-out sessions held at the workshop were used to refine the questionnaire rankings and discuss additional priorities for the three requirement categories. The content requirements breakout group determined that the NAD minimum content guidelines meet the needs of many federal agencies, but additional requirements would be useful: alternate street names, unit type, postal city/state abbreviation, multi-unit structure flag, and some measure of geocode confidence and accuracy.

The metadata breakout session identified three essential additional requirements: address coordinate reference system, coordinate reference system authority, and an indicator of quality. Less important, but desirable were unique IDs and information on the address lifecycle.

The functional requirements breakout session determined that bulk download capability would serve 90% of agency needs, but that several additional functionalities would be useful: feedback mechanisms for error corrections, download tools such as subset download and queuing priority, anytime access via cloud, a batch geocoding service, and the ability to feed updates to classified systems.

A workshop summary session identified several topics for future discussions. These included defining the NAD workflow, how the NAD will be maintained, what quality indicators would be most useful, the propagation of unique IDs, and linkages to relevant datasets such as infrastructure points (e.g. manholes, fire hydrants), building footprints and parcels. Ultimately, a consistent funding stream will be required to act on the issues identified in the workshop.

Subgroups

Subgroups are working groups within FGDC subcommittees that can be created for one year at the discretion of the subcommittee chairs. Subgroups require approval from the FGDC Coordination Group to persist beyond one year. Subgroups can include both members and partners. The Subcommittee discussed possible subgroups around topics such as developing a unique ID, data quality, and linkages to other datasets.

One of the biggest issues facing the Address Theme is how the NAD will be maintained beyond the initial data gathering. Developing a workflow or business process would be an essential next step.

- The challenge is that the origination of the data is at the local level so there are 10K's of entities creating addresses and these data need to be aggregated by counties and states and regularly entered into the NAD.
- How does the pathway get maintained? Does the workflow need to be flexible to accommodate the large variety of entities submitting address data? Flexibility may be a core principle.
- Some working groups might focus on the genetic code of the NAD (i.e. content, quality, unique IDs), but what does the business or operating model look like? The core problem is business related. There is an ecosystem between the federal, state, and local governments and private sector that needs to be defined.

- How does the business process relate to the yet to be written Address Theme strategic plan? Will the strategic plan flow from the business model or should the strategic plan come first?
- Understanding the business process at the county and state level would be useful for designing the NAD business processes.
- Need to concentrate on the value side such as eliminating the need to look for addresses from other sources. Steve Lewis reminded the subcommittee that NSGIC and NGAC have published use cases and there is no need to start from scratch.

A second subgroup was suggested around the topic of content to define the items, tables, and records. That will require a lot of thought to serve the business and use cases.

- Is this already covered under process and updates? Do we need to account for this?
- This may be more of a maintenance question.
- Delivery and mapping companies such as FedEx and Google need to be involved in the discussion.
- Data quality. Publishing something authoritative leads to a positive mission outcome. Include provenance in data queries. Should we separate content and quality?
- Are elections and postal use cases part of the NAD? What do those users need?

The subcommittee decided to table the Content subgroup for now along with the Unique ID subgroup in favor of first concentrating on the mechanics and the business process. The following individuals volunteered to form the Business Process Subgroup:

- Joe Sewash (NC and NSGIC)
- Avi Bender (NTIS)
- Ted Okada (FEMA)
- Martha Wells (URISA)
- Dan Ross (MN and NSGIC)
- Jason Warzinik (Boone County, MO)

DOT and Census will participate on every subgroup, but it was decided that they should not lead.

Next Meeting

The next Subcommittee meeting will be on **Thursday, April 13th at 1-2:30 pm Eastern** at Census HQ and via WebEx. The Subcommittee charter will be the main focus.