<u>Meeting Notes</u>
FGDC Address Subcommittee
February 14, 2018
Census Bureau HQ, Suitland, MD

<u>In-person and On-line Attendance (15 Total):</u>

Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, Census Bureau
Jeanne Cadarette, State of New Hampshire
Stephanie Crews-Jones, Department of Justice
Michael Fashoway, State of Montana
Christian Jacqz, State of Massachusetts
Earl Johnson, U.S. Postal Service
Steve Lewis, Department of Transportation
Jeremy McMullen, State of Vermont
Diane Snediker, Census Bureau/National Center for Education Statistics
Charles Spicer, Census Bureau
Jason Warzinik, Boone County, MO
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, URISA
Sara Yurman, Spatial Focus/URISA
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

<u>Meeting Summary</u>

NAD Updates: Steve Lewis –
- 19 states have been accepted into the NAD with 43 million records accepted for Version 1 release to the DOI GeoPlatform.
- Records in NAD are limited to those with Zip Codes (but an official decision on this is still pending). Subaddresses are not a 'must have' currently.
- Discussions about Zip Codes in the Address Content Subgroup and within the NSGIC Address and Transportation Subgroup are high priority.
- US Postal Service (USPS) participation in the Address Content Subgroup is encouraged.
- Questions:
  o Earl Johnson (USPS) asked if sates are required to submit their address data in the same format to the NAD. Steve Lewis responded that the 19 partners have written their own ETL for transformation of their data to the NAD.

- Announced: Steve, Lynda, and Matt will give presentations on the NAD and the Address Theme at GIS-T (March 19-22, 2018) in Little Rock, AR, and the NSGIC mid–year meeting (February 25-March 1, 2018) in Salt Lake City, UT.

Census Bureau's Beta NAD Evaluation Presentation [for NSGIC]: Matt Zimolzak

- Census conducted a geocoding comparison and address count comparison and analysis using the most current state address data available (a mix of Beta states and the Pilot NAD provided by DOT).
- DOT's initial Quality Checks (QCs) for Data Completeness, Data Quality, and Attribute Domain Quality Assessments were reviewed and reported for each state submission to identify added records, duplicates, invalid geometry, missing zip codes.
- In the Geocoding comparison, NAD County record counts vs the Census County record counts showed minor differences in the spatial accuracy of the address points in relation to county boundaries, perhaps due to the overlap between counties or jurisdictions, ie. Emergency management areas.
- In the Address count comparison, there are significant differences between the composition of the Master Address File (MAF) and the NAD due to the inclusion of commercial, government, non-residential addresses in the NAD.
- MAF address counts by Census 2010 Tabulation Blocks (TABBLOCK) were created for each state and compared with geocoded NAD addresses by TABBLOCK. With these results sorted, additional comparisons and physical conditions were observed using imagery to determine structure inventory and type.
- Visual examples:
    - High Rise Apartments with Basic Street Address (BSA) only, no sub unit addresses.
    - Low Rise Apartments with BSAs only, parcel centroids only.
    - Apartment complex with dozens of BSAs represented with a single parcel centroid.
    - Single family homes (SFH) in new developments/missing address points.
    - Multiple blocks with mixed SFH and Multi-Unit Apartments missing all address points.
    - Gross differences in side-by-side multi-unit structure addressing.
    - Geocoding errors.
    - Missing addresses in resort areas and retirement communities.
    - Large areas devoid of address points, with no obvious explanation.
- Questions:
    - Christian Jacqz asked if there is consideration to standardization of the MAF to FGDC format (rather than doing a count comparison). Matt Zimolzak responded that this sort of analysis on the MAF would be precluded by Title 13 restrictions. Martha Wells added that the Pilot NAD used NENA standard.
    - Ed Wells asked for clarification that the counts from the NAD were spatially joined to the Census TABBLOCK for the unit of comparison, and not geocoded for the Address count analysis. Matt Zimolzak confirmed this.

Update from Workflow Subgroup: Matt Zimolzak

- This working group focuses on workflows from address data providers to aggregators

- Currently working on provider/aggregator to State workflow and identifying QA and AC tests within this workflow.
- Will analyze where current proposed tests align with the FGDC Address standard and apply terminology where applicable (still in progress).
- Will interface with Address Content workgroup to identify the content that supports workflow.

Update from Address Content subgroup status: Matt Zimolzak (for Dave Cackowski)
- This group just had their first meeting and the structure and meeting times were determined; Document in preparation to define scope of this workgroup
- NAD Minimum Content Guidance from the Pilot Project Findings Report will be the initial focus.
- Priority topics: Zip code requirement; and X,Y coordinate system for the crosswalk

Call for Agencies to demo datasets currently in use: Matt Zimolzak (for Lynda Liptrap)
- Lynda Liptrap asks federal agency participants to demo address databases currently in use to support agency missions and use cases
- What structure do you need to support your mission?
- Let her know if you can give a presentation at a future meeting

Other discussion items:
- "Providers" [local] tool for data creators to enable local compliance with minimum guidelines for their address data submissions to the states [Martha Wells]. Mapping science committee, NSF has proposed this tool.

Action item review: Dierdre Bevington-Attardi -
- Lynda Liptrap, Steve Lewis – Consider a bi-monthly schedule for Address Subcommittee Meetings to make progress in the working groups (Address Content WG, Address Workflow WG). Take an e-mail poll to ask people to give their feedback on this.
- Steve Lewis – Check with technical team on whether zero (0) is allowed as a legal value for structure number (house number)/ [Flag as invalid] in the NAD.
- Steve Lewis – Check with technical team on exclusion of P.O. Box Addresses from the NAD.
- Address Content WG – Report on status of Zip Code requirement in future Address Subcommittee meetings.
- Lynda Liptrap/Steve Lewis—Make a decision to share/make public the NAD Evaluation presentation by Matt Zimolzak delivered at today's meeting.

Next meeting: March 14, 1pm at Department of Transportation?. Send Dave Cackowski agenda items.