<u>Meeting Notes</u>
FGDC Address Subcommittee
February 10, 2021
Webinar

<u>Attendance (36 Total):</u>

Carl Anderson, URISA
Florinda Balfour, Department of Veterans Affairs
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, U.S. Census Bureau
Dave Cackowski, U.S. Census Bureau
Megan Compton, State of Indiana
Rodger Coryell, State of New York
Traci Diggs, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Jonathan Duran, State of Arkansas
Jason Ford, GISinc/U.S. Department of Transportation
Laurie Flaherty, U.S. Department of Transportation
Chris Friel, Michael Baker International
Ashley Hitt, Connected Nation
Laura Hogberg, U.S. Census Bureau
Dagmar Lipowsky, Municipio Autonomo De Caguas
Phil Markert, Department of Homeland Security
Jeremy McMullen, State of Vermont
James Meyer, State of Arizona
Julia O'Brien, FEMA
Alesha Perdomo, U.S. Postal Service
Chris Portell, FEMA
Raúl Ríos-Díaz, iCasaPR
Richard Robinson, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Karen Rogers, State of Wyoming
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Andy Rowan, State of New Jersey
Jill Saligoe-Simmel, ESRI
Joe Sewash, State of Virginia
Diane Snediker, U.S. Census Bureau
Jon Sperling, iCasaPR
Thomas Springsteen, HIFLD/Booz Allen Hamilton
Marilia Valdes, FEMA
Paul Watson, U.S. Census Bureau
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, URISA
Frank Winters, State of New York
Matt Zimolzak, U.S. Census Bureau

<u>Meeting Summary</u>

National Address Database (NAD) Updates, Jason Ford (DOT)
- The NAD has new data from Alaska and Texas and a new state participant – Oregon.
- Now have whole state or local participation from 30 states.
- Process Overview
  - Pre-processing Scripts
  - ETL Process
  - Feedback Report
- Added States/Local Entities
  - Alaska: Anchorage, Dillingham, Haines, Yakutat
  - Oregon
  - Texas: 29 Counties
- Updated States/Local Entities
  - Colorado: Added 10 more participating counties
  - Delaware: Kent, Sussex
  - Maine
  - Missouri
  - New York
  - Rhode Island
  - Vermont
- Census identified errors in Missouri and Texas data
  - Records removed from database and feedback provided
  - Working on a process to identify and flag such instances
- Release 4: 53 million records
- Release 5: 58 million records

Puerto Rico Civic Address Vulnerability Evaluation (PRCAVE) Update, Jon Sperling, Raúl Ríos-Díaz (iCasaPR):

- iCasaPR objectives:
  - Create openly available datasets of standardized addresses for Puerto Rico.
  - Provide municipios with cloud-based tools to certify "authoritative" data.
  - Share authoritative data with Federal agencies in a standard agreed-upon format.
- **2021 Stakeholder Meeting:** Puerto Rico Data Governance Gap – Geospatial Strategies After Hurricane Maria
  - Meeting to be held on March 24, 2021 10am-3pm in Puerto Rico and online.
  - Looking for presentations.
  - PRAWG leadership will be invited to share Phase 1-3 Reports.
  - Meeting co-sponsored by the Postal Customer Council (PCC) and US Postal Service.
  - Tentatively scheduled to be an on-site meeting with remote presentation access.

- **The Need**
  - Bring stakeholders to discuss technical issues
  - Present standards, methodologies and a path forward
  - Ensure federal funds for reconstruction are used to improve conditions
- **Next Steps:** Building synergy and connections.
  - Meeting with USPS and PCC personnel to discuss logistics
  - Inviting federal and local government agencies, municipal stakeholders
  - Will conduct pre-event stakeholder meetings to explore needs

NAD Content Recommendations – Continued Discussion on NSGIC NAD Content Position (Jonathan Duran, Frank Winters)
- Summary Statement (from January Meeting)
  - NSGIC endorses and fully supports the list of attributes contained in the *Recommended Content for the National Address Database (NAD)* document submitted by the Address Content Subgroup of the Address Theme Subcommittee on June 8, 2020.
  - NSGIC does not endorse the implied suggestion that the NAD be stored, compiled, or distributed in the FGDC standard. Rather, they strongly recommend that the NAD utilize and adhere to the NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model.
- Discussion Continued
  - Matt Zimolzak – Is there evidence that states not participating are moving to a NENA standard?
    - Dan Ross – I'm not sure we have that evidence, but NextGen 911 is going to push states and local governments in that direction.
    - Karen Rogers – NSGIC best practices recommend states adhere to the NENA GIS Data Model.
  - Matt – The NAD Content Recommendation does not specify a particular format for data submissions. States can submit in the NENA format.
  - Matt – Only one ETL script is needed so it is computer time not human time. A small subset of data would need to be translated since most records are the same or similar in the two standards. How much burden would there be to run standardized ETL scripts to ingest data into the NAD and is it a substantial burden?
    - Frank Winters – We agree that the standards are substantially the same. The magnitude of the burden is an issue given the meager staffing support for the NAD, so why not eliminate any burden?
    - Matt – I'm suggesting that there is minimal effort. Also, there is no barrier to submission. If the NAD adopted the NENA standard what would be the cost to those states that don't use the NENA format?
    - Jason Ford – The ETL doesn't only take computing time. A dataset submitted in NENA format doesn't mean all records are standardized. I don't anticipate that we will have data submitted without requiring

human review any time soon. Moving to a NENA standard would reduce conversion time but it wouldn't mean "no human interaction." Data is submitted cleaner when we provide feedback. For example, New York's data – over 8 million records is [not taking longer conversion time] than smaller newly submitted states.

- o Rodger Coryell – Right now we are at version 1 of the NENA standard. Soon v2 will be released, then quickly v3 with changes to CLDXF. V3 is going to be more different to v2 than v2 is from the FGDC standard. V4 will be a standard that handles relational databases. Possibly 4 versions will be in use concurrently.
- o Karen Rogers – Given the errors in TX and MO that were based on subaddressing, the new NENA standards, if they cover subaddressing, would be good, but this does also complicate things.
- o Jonathan Duran – Can NSGIC get a copy of the questions from this meeting and last?
    - ▪ Matt – Yes, the content group is committed to that after we meet. We do want to make sure discussion is public.
    - ▪ Andy – NSGIC will bring our reactions back to this forum so the discussion can continue to be public.
- o Matt – Concept of flexibility vs. standardization is in the content recommendation. For those providers that don't use the NENA format but meet minimum content, what are the time and resource burdens implied by having to convert these and get them into the NAD? What are the pros and cons of the NENA format vs more flexible approach?
    - ▪ Andy – We are suggesting that the native format of the NAD align with NENA, not saying anything about the providers' format. We like that the content recommendation is flexible.
- o Matt – On what basis is the assertion of wide adoption of the NENA Standard at the local level being made?
    - ▪ Dan – It comes from talking to the many stakeholders and the belief that the NENA standard will be used going forward.
    - ▪ Andy – NextGen 911 is the only thing coming around that's really compelling people to change their process, because they will have incentive to use it or 911 calls won't get routed. Nothing else comes close to getting locals to doing this.
    - ▪ Carl Anderson – Shouldn't we say NENA standards (plural)?
    - ▪ Andy – At any given moment there is one.
    - ▪ Ed Wells – is it fair to say the data model incorporates the CLDXF? We speak of plural in that sense. There will be those using older versions of the standard so there will be transition phases and a need to handle multiple versions.
    - ▪ Jonathan – NextGen 911 is an extremely compelling use case and is a very big driver. Basis for the assertion is the work I do every day in Arkansas.

The NENA standard is what is going to happen. NG911 doesn't happen without GIS data.

- o Matt – is the NENA Standard the only standard to meet NextGen 911 requirements?
  - Frank – I think so.
  - Andy – One that can't be avoided is CLDXF since that's how 911 calls are routed. So not the only choice but the only real practical choice.
  - Dan – The standard also really drives intrastate and interstate collaboration.
  - Andy – With the adoption of NENA standards, 911 authorities demand that vendors follow the NENA Standards.

Action Items

- Address Content Subgroup will meet and consider changes based on the NSGIC response.

Next meeting: Wednesday, March 10, 2020 at 11am ET.