

Meeting Notes
FGDC Address Subcommittee
August 14, 2019
US Department of Transportation, Washington, DC

Attendance (16 Total):

Aisha Ahmad, US Postal Service
Dave Cackowski, Census Bureau
Daniel Diaz Torres, Puerto Rico Planning Board
Jonathan Duran, State of Arkansas
Michael Fashoway, State of Montana
Christian Jacqz, State of Massachusetts
Steve Lewis, Department of Transportation
Lynda Liptrap, Census Bureau
Jeremy McMullen, State of Vermont
Jim Meyer, State of Arizona
Amy Nelson, Department of Transportation
Eileen Poueymirou Yunque, Puerto Rico Planning Board
Raul Rios Diaz, iCasaPR
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, Spatial Focus/URISA
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

NAD Updates: Steve Lewis

- NAD Release 3, originally scheduled for release in the first week of August is delayed.
- Texas parsing wasn't as successful as first thought – Texas data was pulled from Release 3.
- Release 3 now has one new state, Wisconsin, and updates from Arizona, Arkansas, Massachusetts, Montana, New Mexico, New York (including NYC), and Rhode Island. There are 48.6 million records and it will be available next week.
- New Partners:
 - Georgia, Louisiana, and Wyoming will submit data from individual counties and parishes. DOT has received data from Campbell, Cook, and Teton, WY and from East Baton Rouge and Terrebone, LA.
 - Nebraska, a year away from being able to provide data, became a partner and was added to the 'In Queue' category.
 - Tribal – The National Tribal Geographic Information Support Center has been encouraging tribes to participate in the NAD.

- Tribal – The Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota has agreed to become a partner and will provide data this week.
- The Seneca Nation in New York has agreed to become a partner, but their data is already in the New York submitted data.
- Possible Domain Addition – In general, domain values come from Pub 28. The Latest Arkansas data had 70,000 records marked ‘Agricultural’. Should this be a new ‘Address Type’ domain value?
- The current contract for the ETL developer ends on 8/31/2019. NHTSA has promised additional funding in FY2020, but the contract must be re-competed. There will be an estimated 30-120 days of ‘stop work’.

Content Recommendations for the National Address Database (NAD): Dave Cackowski

- The Address Content Subgroup has initial recommendations for NAD Content.
- First that the NAD shall include addresses in the following classes:
 - Thoroughfare Classes – Numbered thoroughfare addresses, intersection addresses, two-number address ranges, and unnumbered thoroughfare addresses.
 - Landmark Classes – Landmark addresses and community addresses.
- Next the NAD Capabilities should include: Address data elements and data record structures needed for the address classes, a UUID that persists for each address, address authority, address mapping, address – to – address and address – to – parcel relationships, documentation and quality control, provider and dataset identification, and support for NAD workflows.
- NAD Content should include:
 - Address Elements: Address number, street name, subaddress elements; landmark name elements, place and state name elements.
 - Address Attributes: UUID, address authority, address coordinates and address position, address relationship type, address-parcel ID and ID source, address classification and other documentation, QC attributes, address direct source and dataset ID, QC test results.
 - NAD metadata and dataset metadata
- Proposed changes from the NAD Pilot Schema:
 - For elements where the FGDC definition and the CLDXF definition are the same or similar, the FGDC definition will be used
 - Bulk Delivery ZIP Code and Bulk Delivery ZIP + 4 Addition will be excluded
 - Building, Floor, Unit, Room, Additional Location Info will be combined into Subaddress Element.
 - GUID will be changed to UUID.
- New Attributes
 - Mandatory: Address Classification and Data Set ID
 - Optional: Address Elevation, Address Feature Type, Address Lifecycle Status, Address Anomaly Status, Related Address ID, Address Relation Type, Address Parcel Identifier Source, Address Parcel Identifier, Address Anomaly Status,

Location Description, Subaddress Component Order, Element Sequence Number, Place Name Type, FIPS State County Code, Delivery Address Type.

- Discussion
 - Elaboration on the Dataset ID – It is coding the dataset and its iteration – it is a versioning of the dataset and information about the source.
 - Christian – regarding the six address classes: there are lots of addresses that are in multiple classes. Ed – there is lots of flexibility in classifying addresses. Lynda – asked state representatives how they handle landmark addresses. Christian – in Massachusetts we don't have a landmark class. Our address collection is mainly driven by E911, so our classes are different (sites, subsites, etc.), based on the purpose of finding someone at any location. We would need an algorithm to put addresses into classifications.
 - Lynda – requests that the Address Content Subgroup look at the NAD Federal User Requirements Workshop Report recommendations to make sure we haven't missed anything.
 - Steve – In a NSGIC poll of 19 providers of NAD data, 15 of them use the CLDXF standard, and 2 use FGDC. It seems like we shouldn't receive data in one standard and transform to another.
 - Martha – CLDXF is a one-purpose standard and dependent on having a robust database in a standard. If we want the NAD to be useful for other purposes, we need to look at having a robust standard.
 - Steve – NAD was developed with the help of providers, so I want to make sure they are okay with this.
 - Ed – the two standards are not that different and FGDC allows more flexibility to providers.
 - Christian – no question that FGDC is more flexible. States won't be constrained by this.
 - Steve – I'm not pro or con, I just want to make sure my providers don't have objections.
 - Michael Fashoway – I have no issues with using FGDC. I would like to see a schema and I have a question on 'formal profile of the FGDC' on slide 6. Ed – a profile extends a base standard for a particular use – describes how the NAD fits into the federal standard.
 - Jonathan Duran – more and more states will be gravitating towards the NENA CLDXF standard which is something to be mindful of. Matt – it comes down to who is doing the ETL, which the provider can do if they want. If they don't the federal aggregator will do it. We have established that this does not make it more difficult for providers.
 - Michael – if there are accommodations for the fact that we are compiling data from a NextGen911 starting point, we will be ok.
 - Jeremy McMullen – we have no issues.
 - Steve – I would like to see a white paper on the benefits of the FGDC standard vs. the CLDXF standard.

Puerto Rico Address Data Work Group (PRADWG) Update: Lynda Liptrap

- PRADWG Phase 2 will focus on federal agency requirements for Puerto Rico address data and will kick-off in September, first re-establishing the working group participants.
- Workshop on Authoritative Addresses for Puerto Rico in Federal, State, and Local Datasets was held 7/16-7/18/2019 in San Juan, Puerto Rico.
 - Brought together Puerto Rico address stakeholders to start the change from ‘one house, multiple addresses’ to ‘one house, one address’.
 - Organized by the Initiative for Civic Address Systems Assessment in Puerto Rico (iCasaPR) and hosted by the Puerto Rico Science, Technology and Research Trust.
 - Next Steps
 - Workshop report
 - Puerto Rico Civic Address Standardization Initiative Technical Advisory Task Force to explore implementation issues related to the FGDC Address Standard for Puerto Rican style addresses.
- Discussion
 - Raul – after the workshop the Puerto Rico government signed a new law regarding open data which creates new positions to put forth an open data agenda. We are holding an address matching workshop in Washington in late September or early October. The post workshop document will be out soon.
 - Eileen – thank you for having us on this call and the Planning Board remains available to help.

Address Theme Strategic Plan: Lynda Liptrap

- 3 goals:
 - Ensure the Effective Development of the Address Theme Datasets
 - Facilitate the Sharing and Distribution of Address Theme Datasets
 - Coordinate Among the Address Theme Stakeholders.
- Next Steps
 - Submit plan to the FGDC
 - Develop the Implementation Plan
- Send any comments you have on the plan to Lynda

Action Items

- White paper on FGDC standard vs. CLDXF standard – Address Content Subgroup
- Crosswalk from NAD Pilot Schema to Proposed New NAD Schema – Address Content Subgroup
- Review NAD Federal Workshop Report – Address Content Subgroup
- Provide further comments/questions on address content recommendations – Address Subcommittee members

- Provide comments on Strategic Plan – Address Subcommittee members (Lynda will provide a deadline for comments)

Next meeting: Wednesday, September 11, 2019. Details to follow.