

Meeting Notes  
FGDC Address Subcommittee  
May 10, 2017  
Department of Transportation, Washington, DC

In-person and On-line Attendance (30 total):

Carl Anderson, URISA  
Florinda Balfour, Veterans Affairs  
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, Census Bureau  
Michael Byrne, CFPB  
Jennifer Carlino, USGS/FGDC  
Chris Carver, NENA  
Michael Fashoway, State of Montana  
Ben Gurga, SSA  
Parrish Henderson, FBI  
Mark Holmes, State of Michigan  
Christian Jacqz, MA/Next Gen 911  
John Koudelka, DOE, Idaho National Laboratory  
Mark Lange, Census Bureau  
Steve Lewis, DOT  
Lynda Liptrap, Census Bureau  
Eric Litt, Department of Veterans Affairs  
Kenny Miller, Michael Baker  
Donna Pena, State of California  
Curtis Pulford, State of Arizona  
Krystal Repoff, NOAA(?)  
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota  
Rob Seay, Social Security Administration  
Joe Sewash, State of North Carolina  
Tina Smith, DOJ  
Dianne Snediker, Census Bureau  
Jon Sperling, HUD  
Ed Wells, URISA  
Martha Wells, Spatial Focus/URISA  
Nate Workman, FEMA  
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

Subcommittee Co-chairs Steve Lewis and Mark Lange welcomed members and partners to the meeting and Mark provided an update on recent Address Theme activities. A near-final subcommittee charter was circulated that incorporated the discussions from the April meeting and, barring objection, this version will go out to members for a vote later this month. Donna Pena with State of California 9-1-1 suggested that following Project Management Institute (PMI) guidelines for a charter might be beneficial and

would require some refinements to the language to have the proper format and impact. She offered to provide edits along those lines by the end of the week. Mark agreed to circulate any additional edits in a final version of the charter and to close the comment period.

Steve Lewis provided an update on the NAD, which he characterized as turning lemons into lemonade. The NAD Pilot ended last summer and has since fought to find funding, leaving no resources to host or provide the data to the public as planned. An anonymous person self-identified only as a “taxpayer” filed a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the address information collected during the NAD Pilot project. In response, DOT made the data available to the individual who immediately posted it on GitHub, apparently as part of the Open Addresses community. The posted data covers all or portions of AR, AZ, DC, MO, NJ, OH, UT, and VA for a total of 16.8 million address points. There was some frustration with the antagonistic manner of the request given that the objective of the Address Theme is to make address point data publicly available and is not in opposition to the Open Addresses effort. Donna Pena (State of California) mentioned that she received a similar request in an equally cryptic manner. Steve has since received funding to hire a developer to load additional state data into the NAD and make that data broadly available. The developer is expected to be on board by mid-June.

In response to a question about reviewing the NAD data collected during the pilot, Steve said the review is open ended and unstructured, i.e. anyone is welcome to take a look and examine the data in the context of their own requirements. URISA representatives highlighted the occasionally strange and complex addressing (e.g. negative address numbers in the Portland, OR metro area) that may not fit the minimum content guidelines as they are now defined.

## Presentation

Dan Ross, Chief GIO of Minnesota, gave a presentation on Minnesota’s ongoing work building a collaborative process for address point data for the state. [Note: Dan’s presentation will soon be made available on the Address Theme Community page on the GeoPlatform]. Dan outlined a 2-year process to aggregate point address data from the authoritative sources that included cities, counties, state agencies, and some private companies. They brought stakeholders together to begin developing a common standard for the data and define roles and responsibilities. They agreed to use the authoritative data source wherever possible. Standards became a big focus and the state looked at existing standards such as NENA, FGDC, and other state-specific standards to avoid starting from scratch. Because Next Gen 9-1-1 is a state-wide effort and needs to meet certain standards within three years, its priorities drive local data collection and, in many cases, data maintenance. The state then developed methods for data intake and harmonization and routines that validate the data through 109 different checks. Many of these checks (written in Python) are for internal consistency such as the spelling of street names, features of center lanes, and ensuring field names are consistent across datasets and are based on FGDC and NENA standards. The goal is to validate,

standardize, then aggregate the data. The reports produced by the validation checks are then sent to the original data provider.

There is an understandable push to share the validated data back local communities and the state will release data in common formats. The structure of the workflow creates multiple ways for authoritative sources to interact with the system. One of those ways is through a new set of editing tools that have recently been rolled out with the intent of putting those tools in the hands of data providers. It was important to take security into account because of the use of these data for NG9-1-1. A secure portal was created for each data provider with a unique IP address and more security related activities are occurring as budgets permit. There are currently 86 address point datasets on the state portal and counties are responsible for getting data for the municipalities within their jurisdictions. They are currently half complete and are asking that corrections made by local authoritative sources be made using the new state schema. The validations are then re-run each time updates are submitted.

Unique IDs will be assigned by the state automatically as each address is loaded in to the database the first time and local partners are asked to use these to maintain the history over time. Downloads are available for individual counties and state hosting tools help the cities who do not have the resources.

At the conclusion of Dan's talk, the subcommittee applauded Minnesota's efforts and progress. Comments were made that the state put together great opportunities and did a good job thinking things through, while not letting perfect be the enemy of good. A question was asked regarding transactional updates and the potential for using change detection to identify and ingest only the addresses that are new or changed. Dan responded that change detection is part of the set of new tools they have developed, but that they are currently ingesting the entire dataset from providers each time. A question was asked about the level of funding that NG9-1-1 brought to the process. Dan answered that there was a \$3.8 million budget estimated for the data preparation work. Dan provided his email address and offered to answer questions if anyone would like more information. [Dan.ross@state.mn.us](mailto:Dan.ross@state.mn.us)

### Wrap-up Discussion

The subcommittee concluded the meeting with a follow-on discussion of how state processes for aggregating local authoritative address point data might be scaled up to the national level. There was some agreement that many of the validations could be rolled into a national workflow, but that it would be overly onerous to do NG9-1-1 quality level. Reacting to a draft workflow diagram shown by Mark Lange, several state subcommittee members emphasized that data quality feedback from the NAD managers to the local source should go through the state aggregators and not directly to the local source. The workflow diagram will be handed off to the nascent Business Processes Workgroup for refinement,

The subcommittee then engaged in a discussion of the regional complexities in addressing and how that complexity can be handled in the NAD workflow. URISA representatives pointed out that many addresses are maintained by local authorities rather than 911 authorities (e.g. tax databases), many are unmailable, some are P.O. boxes, etc. They suggested that these complexities are not accounted for in many state aggregation processes. NSGIC representatives made the case that states already recognize these complexities and many include address points for the rooftop, front door, and parcel center as well as subaddresses that are unmailable such as park pavilions. These address types are not in the NAD schema as it now exists, but many states stand ready to provide these data if the NAD schema is ever expanded. The capability to handle complex addresses is not the issue. Politics, defining roles, and funding are the issues. It is not hard to feed data into the NAD because the schema is compatible.

### Next Meeting

The next Subcommittee meeting will be on **Wednesday, June 14<sup>th</sup>** from 1-2:30 pm Eastern at Census HQ in Suitland, MD and via WebEx.