

A Meeting Notes
FGDC Address Subcommittee
April 13, 2017
Census Bureau, Suitland, MD

In-person and On-line Attendance (28 total):

Carl Anderson, URISA
Florinda Balfour, VA
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, Census Bureau
Michael Byrne, CFPB
Jennifer Carlino, USGS/FGDC
Chris Carver, NENA
Stephanie Crew-Jones, DOJ
Matt Crosset, DC GIS
Ben Gurga, SSA
Michael Gurley, State of Oregon
Roger Hixson, NENA
Christian Jacqz, MA/Next Gen 911
John Koudelka, DOE, Idaho National Laboratory
Mark Lange, Census Bureau
Josh Linard, DOE
Lynda Liptrap, Census Bureau
Robert Renner, HUD
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Pascal Schuback, Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup
Tim Scott, State of New Hampshire
Joe Sewash, State of North Carolina
Dianne Snediker, Census Bureau
Tim Trainor, Census Bureau
Jason Warznik, Boone County, Missouri
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, Spatial Focus/URISA
Nate Workman, FEMA
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

Review of Progress on Theme Goals

Co-chair Mark Lange updated the group on progress made towards several of the Subcommittee's goals. The FGDC Steering Committee approved the Address Theme definition, making the theme official. This is a milestone for the Theme. In the process, the Subcommittee also checked off a box at the Government Accountability Office (GAO), which closed an action for the FGDC to create the Address Theme.

The GAO asked the Director of the Census Bureau if there was a cost benefit analysis done to get insight into the savings of a National Address Database. If anyone is aware of such an analysis or is interested in doing so, please contact Co-theme Lead Lynda Liptrap. Tim Trainor of the Census Bureau reported that NGAC did some use cases, but there was no formal effort to calculate a return on investment. This is of interest to OMB as well. As an example, USGS did an exhaustive requirements study for 3DEP and this worked well to support their program. For NG9-1-1, depending on the timing, the NAD could assist state 911s in developing their address databases. There are also other potential savings at the state and local level in addition to savings for the federal government.

There were two Address Theme presentations in March. The first was at the NGAC meeting on March 22nd by the SAOGIs from DOT (Steve Lewis) and Commerce (Tim Trainor). A second update was given to the FGDC Steering Committee on March 23rd by the Theme co-leads Lynda Liptrap and Steve Lewis. Both of these presentations are available on the [NGAC](#) and [Steering Committee](#) meeting web sites. The NAD Federal User Requirements Workshop report is in process and will be available this summer.

Charter

The Subcommittee co-chairs received good feedback on the first version of the Charter from NSGIC Address Committee. In response to this feedback, several improvements have been made to version 2 of the charter circulated to the subcommittee last week. The Background section has been scaled back, reference to a governance board have been removed, and duplication between the Scope and Objectives sections have been resolved. FGDC subcommittee charters are typically revisited on a three-year cycle.

The subcommittee engaged in a discussion of the charter. In general, most thought that the charter read much better than the first version. There was some discussion around whether the President's Management Agenda should be included in the Background section, but it was agreed that this was unnecessary.

The Subcommittee did some minor wordsmithing in the Purpose section and then debated the use of the phrase, "governance process" in the Scope section. The phrase, "prioritization process" was suggested because the Subcommittee determines priorities for the Theme. There was also a good discussion of the phrase, "unrestricted access" to national address data. There may be good reasons to limit access to some address data such as historical sites, military sites, and American Indian sites. If we demand all data be available to everyone, the owners of those addresses will choose not to expose their data and simply not participate, resulting in a perpetually incomplete NAD. On the other hand, the Address Theme was established to make spatially referenced address data publicly accessible and limiting access to large portions of the NAD would go against this purpose. The Subcommittee decided to remove the word, "unrestricted" and insert the word, "public" in the Scope in recognition of these concerns from both perspectives. Continuing their discussion of the Scope section, the Subcommittee improved the list of standards organizations, removing National Spatial Data Infrastructure and

adding National Emergency Numbers Association and Open Geospatial Consortium. There was also additional wordsmithing in the partnership bullet.

In the Objectives section, the Subcommittee agreed that the primary objective should not be to simply, “support the Address Theme,” but rather to identify and document a sustainable process for producing the Theme. After some discussion, the Subcommittee decided to focus on measurable actions rather than vague statements like, “be aware of.” They also agreed that collecting user requirements from potential NAD users across a wide spectrum of organization types (for-profit, non-profit, and public) at different scales (local to national) was important. They also agreed that the Subcommittee should play a role in coordinating among the various data users and producers. This focus on users needs and coordination gets directly at the business case for the Theme; that is, address data is widely needed basic data that will quickly be integrated into agency SDIs and workflows and mashed-up with other datasets. This simple, high value data will greatly reduce the number of ad-hoc address databases residing throughout government. This is the value proposition to GAO and OMB and the Subcommittee Objectives need to reflect this.

The Subcommittee agreed that the Charter edits discussed during this meeting were sufficient to move forward with a member vote. A final version of the charter incorporating these edits will be circulated to the Subcommittee for review prior to a Subcommittee member vote.

Wrap-up and Next Meeting Agenda

The Subcommittee discussed possible agenda items for future meetings. The Subcommittee co-chairs have discussed soliciting presentations from organizations that have gone through the Extract, Transform, and Load (ETL) process during the original NAD Pilot. The Subcommittee agreed and Dan Ross of Minnesota volunteered to share his state’s experience. It was also suggested that the contractor that ran the NAD Pilot would have a useful perspective. There was also discussion of the need for additional subgroups to begin better defining content and metadata to move forward in parallel with the business process subgroup.

Next Meeting

The next Subcommittee meeting will be on **Wednesday, May 10th** at 1-2:30 pm Eastern at DOT and via WebEx.