

## ASMS Meeting Minutes

10/20/2021, 2:00 PM

1. In attendance:
  - a. Sean Uhl
  - b. Jacob Twarog
  - c. Laura Henderson
  - d. Carl Anderson
  - e. Rodger Coryell
  - f. Fred lausly
  - g. Armando Garcia
  - h. Ken Denson
  - i. Matthew Zimolzak
  - j. Donna Pena
  - k. Raul Rios
  - l. Sara Yurman
  - m. Matthew Yurman
  - n. Stuart Irby
  - o. Ed Wells
  - p. Aaron Choate
2. Introduction of New Members/Guests
3. Update on Wisconsin address number parsing discussion
  - a. Fred provided a draft re-wording
  - b. Any comments or feedback?
    - i. From Sean – document and wording looked fine in the document. In Part 4, that part also describes the address elements. We need to update the description there as well. We need to make sure this gets done when the time comes.
    - ii. From Matt – Question about the document. When I look at the examples I see the old version crossed out and the replacement reflecting the new approach. In the old example, after the second directional in the address expression (prefix section), the original has the number following the second directional. In the new example, there is no number there's just the directional. What is the logic behind this and why is the example changing?
      1. The change is how it is being used in the field. In the city or county of Waukesha, the last five digits (numbers) are actually the house number (the way they see it in their system). Before we used 58 in the house number and that is not how it is applied in the field.
      2. Matt – what it describes is how it's being used in a particular locality. This type of address style is not unique to Waukesha, WI, this quadrant-based system. Other counties in Wisconsin and a few other western cities use this as well. Is this applicable to them as well?
        - a. From Fred - Other neighboring counties use this and they follow the exact same use. Cannot speak to Utah example.

- b. From Ed – Document states that local knowledge is required to know when the grid cell identifier stops and the address number begins. It covers the possibility that this is done slightly differently elsewhere. Are there other examples we could take a look at (ex. In Illinois?)
  - c. From Fred – when we were doing our next-gen 911 analysis, we looked at Illinois and our understanding was that they dropped this and moved to a more standard addressing. At least in the examples we’ve found so far, this seems to be a SE Wisconsin example. It does state that local knowledge is needed, which should cover other scenarios. Perhaps we should include a Utah clause?
  - d. From Ed – Utah numbers are also slightly different and my understanding was that there was a part of the FGDC standard that already covered this? I will see if we can find the example to circulate. It is different in Utah to Wisconsin.
  - e. From Sean – if we know of examples where addresses are handled slightly different, there’s no reason we cannot have multiple examples. However, there is not a technical change going on here it is an implementation address, so to speak.
  - f. From Matt – What the standard allows for is that you can parse your address number into a prefix, a base, and a suffix. How you do that is up to you. We have examples that show some on-the-ground real-world examples and the Waukesha example is one real-world example.
  - g. From Matt – the ones that are being removed, the Blue Mound and Oak Road example – are we sure these are not valid anywhere?
    - i. From Ed - Blue Mound comes from USPS publication 28.
  - h. From Matt – the other question is Utah specific since we know that locales in Utah use a grid-based system that differs from Waukesha and SE Wisconsin in general. Should we not include this as an example?
    - i. From Fred – The two examples are from Waukesha, so that’s why those were adjusted. If there is an example from Utah we would like to include, we should do that.
    - ii. From Sean – yes, good to look into. Sean will try to dig up some examples. Ed will look into the existing standard for the Utah example.
- 4. Update on reconciling the FGDC Address Standard with the FGDC framework standard Part 7, Transportation
  - a. Proposal to develop and publish white papers for complex topics such as this one
    - i. Possibly publishing to GEO Platform

- b. A group met on the 8<sup>th</sup> (maybe 6 of us or so) to discuss the topic. We ended up mostly discussing how to handle these most complex examples in general.
  - i. Agreed that starting out with white papers for some of these topics would be a good way of organizing our thoughts and soliciting input from addressing stakeholders. Good way to get the proposal into stakeholders hands.
    - 1. While these papers could be shared in many different ways, whether this be at conferences or distributing to organizations, one idea that was given was to post them to GEO Platform. We have started conversations with Census colleagues who work with GEO Platform and the IT specialists related to that.
    - 2. There will be an internal meeting next week about this. Once we get to this point, we will need some input on what we would like for that page to look like.
    - 3. Sean is leaning towards it actually being a page for this group with the white papers being a part of that page, that way we could put other things there as well. This would mimic the pages that exist for other subgroups.
    - 4. If anyone is interested in participating, please let Sean know.
    - 5. From Carl – DOI runs something similar, can be of assistance if necessary.
      - a. Will supply two names to add to this meeting.
    - 6. Sean – Ed, you reported there is not yet a draft of the white paper. Are there any issues or can you report on when there might be a draft?
      - a. Ed – yes. Will re-cast the discussion draft that was brought to the group last time as this white paper. Has been in development.
      - b. What is the problem we're trying to solve? What is needed? Have used this as a framework for this document to see if there's a way to reconcile the transportation standard and the address standard. What we're really talking about is bringing address geometric elements into the standard.
        - i. 4 elements, two of which are:
          - 1. Address points, so that we can put attributes on those points. As the Census pointed out, this would be to create the map position element.
          - 2. Relating addresses to road centerlines for navigation purposes.
        - ii. Will demonstrate how these elements are linked and how the goal is shared.
        - iii. Will send to Sean later in this week.
- 5. Discuss use of Wiki for doc review and comments (Carl Anderson and Sara Yurman will lead the discussion)

- a. Background – there was a wiki that was used in the development of the original standard. Allowed multiple users to make inline edits directly to the draft, along with comments, etc. Matt Y., Carl A., Sara Y. and Ken D. have agreed to share their expertise.
- b. Sara - Spatial focus has been running Wikis for 15-20 years. This has been a really useful tool for the aforementioned reasons and more. Ed may have a better user perspective?
  - i. Ed – the value of the wiki is twofold. One – enables people to comment from most any place without requiring a meeting. This allows dialog and collaboration at many levels, from detailed to general. The editing and update tools were crucial to create a document that was consistent. For instance, if you changed a header in one place, you can apply this throughout.
  - ii. Matt McReady and Carl spent significant effort extracting info into normative fashions that could be utilized by others. The wiki made editing easier. However, it did not make normative publication easier. This was a big lift. We could have a document that you could browse as a web document, but it is not consumable as a standard for XML or JSON or other things, it's simply a document. This challenge exists here as well. That part of publication is a critical part of whatever we do. 15 years ago, what Sara and Ken had stood up, there are likely new tools and methodologies available but Carl is not totally versed on them so can't speak to that as much.
  - iii. Sara – there are a variety of Wikis, we can explore them. There are wikis that go into different kinds of repositories, so while one particular variety was settled on to meet our specific needs, there are others.
  - iv. Carl – We need to develop a toolset to build a normative XML document. This standard requires machine-readable components, we should create a toolset that will support this requirement.
  - v. Ed – I hear 3 aspects which are important –
    1. Does it allow or facilitate public comments from a wide variety of sources?
    2. Does it allow text changes to be propagated so that text is consistent?
    3. Can you then go from text to XML well?
  - vi. Matt – it does appear based on a quick google that there is an export function that will do some of this stuff.
    1. Carl – can we validate that it would meet FGDC standards?
    2. Sara – let's try it.
  - vii. Sara – The big lift was also the Microsoft Word document format. Does the Word requirement still exist? Because we could not just give a PDF right out of the wiki.
    1. Carl – the PDF linked to the external content and not internally referencing links. We would need a self-inclusive PDF that did not have external links.
    2. Sean – the directives have not changed in years. I think there are a lot of discussions at FGDC so Matt Z. we may need to take this offline and see when we are going to get some guidance on whether or not Word is a required format. Are we still dealing with old requirements? Maybe

we need to make a case for being able to pursue a new (less arcane) format provided this is what we need to do to accomplish what we want.

3. Matt Z – this is one of a plethora of questions that need to be answered in terms of guidance from FGDC. There is a proposal on the table to re-organize the FGDC standards work group which will focus on all things standards for FGDC. This would disseminate guidance on standards and provide a forum where standards could be discussed and a ruling or guidance could be provided. My understanding is there is support amongst FGDC leaders for this. As far as the work of this group goes:
  - a. Do not let this stop this group from making progress.
  - b. Can we incorporate working through a wiki that allows for some flexibility that could produce a doc either in Word format as the last guidance had been, or PDF format? Can we be flexible so that when guidance comes down, we are flexible enough to accommodate that?
4. Sean – we need to plan for the worst and hope for the best. Be prepared to have to meet these existing requirements but do our best to keep our eye on what may be the preferred (better) way of accomplishing these goals. Hopefully this will not be too much work.
5. Matt Z – let me outline it for you. The reality of the situation is, there are many who are working on the various themes in the FGDC community are waiting on the OMB guidance which was supposed to be available in the summer but is not yet available. We should proceed as far as we can go to facilitate the work, retain options for flexibility if possible. If not possible, make the best judgement we can about the best method to use until guidance does become available which may require some re-work later (which will be no-one's fault). Do not expect guidance soon. My guess is the Word vs. PDF question is not a priority question versus the other questions the standards group will be required to evaluate.
6. Ed – the requirements 20 years ago for .DOC format was to be vendor-neutral when publishing FGDC standards (so that they could be widely disseminated). Certainly now .PDF can provide for this distribution requirement, or we could make the case that it would be able to. We could just move forward with this assumption.
7. Matt Z – if the body that comes together goes in a different direction, you may have to come up with the approved solution rather than what you've been working on. It could be a calculated risk, although I'm inclined to agree.
8. Carl – links internal to the wiki become external and limited to the document (PDF WORD whatever). If we don't do the link conversion which was the crux prior, we can output the text but we lose the value

when all the links get broken. Please verify that in all of the formats you're suggesting.

- a. Sara – we were able to overcome this.
  - b. Carl – this required a lot of effort.
  - c. Sara – we are not volunteering, but we would be happy to support another tool if we had one. The Wiki just seems like a good solution relative to the tracking comments etc.
9. Sean – I'm wondering how much of that same lift is going to be required when we're talking about a small set of revisions to the document. Do we expect that because we're going to have to do these revisions, are we expecting the same lift?
- a. Version 2 will have to be public in some format.
  - b. Speculation on Matt Y's part, but the tools for exports and such are much more advanced than they were 10 years ago.
  - c. Carl – can we work together on a white paper showing this is true?
  - d. Sara – we require a test bed to give this a go. Agrees.
  - e. Carl – we can build tools to do anything so long as we know we need the tools ahead of time.
  - f. Sara – the last time, we just got to the end and hit a wall.
  - g. Carl – Matt McReady and Carl did a ton of extra effort to get things right. This would be great if whatever we were using to edit provided these tools.
  - h. Sean – the second version we put out is going to be (not sure what percentage is going to have to be different). Are we really expecting the same reengineering effort that had to go into the first round? Are we expecting the same lift to be necessary this round?
  - i. Carl – As the prior version came to fruition, it became difficult to track changes in the wiki versus versions of the document. Sara, Ken and myself agreed to do a research study and provide input. If the tools will output to whatever, we can edit in whatever format works.
  - j. Sara – we want to do this in a thoughtful way. We don't want to be limited in any way.
  - k. Matt Z – one more punt option. Another way to handle this issue (if you're concerned about reinventing the wheel because you're waiting for guidance). We can take this as far down the path as we can go with a subgroup discussion (and proposals) and not take it any further until FGDC offers guidance.
10. Sean – wrap up. We have volunteers to do some research and provide background information on the toolset for doc review.

6. Sean – we can have a discussion offline. I will help any way I can to facilitate things if that would help. Why don't we take this offline to see if we can come up with a plan or timeline for what the next steps are?
  - a. Carl, Sara, Ken, Matt Y will likely be involved as well.
  - b. Carl – Sara FYI – I want to get a JSON in addition to XML output so we have two vectors in addition to the normative text.
    - i. Sara – Sounds good.
  - c. Sean will reach out later this week to make sure we can have a discussion. Any other parties that want to join?
    - i. We will have a meeting and send out an invite for this discussion to the group.
7. Sean – we will skip the next November meeting as we'll be in the holiday season. We may run into the winter holidays if we have a meeting too much later as well. We will have a meeting in early December and will pick up on the monthly meetings again in January. We will move forward with these topics offline and via email.
8. Thanks to guests who joined us, your help is appreciated.

Meeting Conclusion – 3:05 PM

Did not get to:

9. Begin discussion on adding a conformance clause to the address standard (time permitting)