<u>Meeting Notes</u>
FGDC Address Subcommittee
January 13, 2021
Webinar

<u>Attendance (35 Total):</u>

Florinda Balfour, Department of Veterans Affairs
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, U.S. Census Bureau
Dave Cackowski, U.S. Census Bureau
Sara Cassidy, U.S. Census Bureau
Rodger Coryell, State of New York
Carmen Diaz, Municipio Autonomo De Caguas
Jonathan Duran, State of Arkansas
Ross Epstein, SafeGraph
Craig Fargione, State of New York
Chris George, U.S. Virgin Islands
Morgen Healy, AppGeo
Ashley Hitt, Connected Nation
Laura Hogberg, U.S. Census Bureau
Christian Jacqz, State of Massachusetts
Steve Lewis, U.S. Department of Transportation
Phil Markert, Department of Homeland Security
James Meyer, State of Arizona
Julia O'Brien, FEMA
Donna Pena, State of California
Chris Portell, FEMA
Raúl Ríos-Díaz, iCasaPR
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
Ed Wells, URISA
Martha Wells, URISA
Steve Whitney, Pima County, Arizona
Frank Winters, State of New York
Matt Zimolzak, U.S. Census Bureau

<u>Meeting Summary</u>

National Address Database (NAD) Updates, Steve Lewis (DOT)
- In the process of closing out release 5. Will have some new Alaska Boroughs and Oregon's initial submission. Connecticut's first submission will be in release 6

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

- On behalf of the Initiative for *Civic Address Systems Assessment In Puerto Rico* (iCasaPR), Jon Sperling discussed current status and next steps being taken by iCasaPR to support Puerto Rico's addressing infrastructure in 2021.
- **Introduction:** Sperling provided an overview of 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.
  - *iCasaPR* is a multidisciplinary initiative to improve the address infrastructure of Puerto Rico and to inspire breakthroughs in the way we tackle the issue of "data invisibility" affecting communities in Puerto Rico.
- **Previous Stakeholders Meetings:** A brief review of stakeholder meetings were discussed:
  - **Workshop on Authoritative Addresses for Puerto Rico in Federal, State & Local Datasets** was held from July 16th to July 18th, 2019 in Puerto Rico.
  - Federal agencies and local Stakeholders met to discuss objectives and methodology.
  - Participating agencies included:
    - U.S. Census Bureau
    - Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
    - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
    - U.S. Postal Service (USPS)/National Customer Support Center and Caribbean Meeting.
    - Puerto Rico Planning Board
    - NGO and non-profit organizations including the Caribbean Postal Customer Council (PCC), Puerto Rico Society of Planning and Red de Fundaciones (now Filantropia Puerto Rico).
    - Subject matter experts on the FGDC "United States Thoroughfare, Landmark and Postal Address Data Standard"
    - Workshop focused on conducting open discussions with subject matter experts on ways to improve address governance and the addressing infrastructure of Puerto Rico. This ongoing technical discussion is critical to identify effective implementation strategies related to civic addresses,

ensure consistency with federal guidelines and programs, and ensure the proper use of Federal funds earmarked toward these purposes.
- The highly productive and informative discussions of the workshop revealed a substantive degree of convergence and common ground that will be useful as we develop a shared understanding of how addressing practices can be improved.
- An outcome of the meeting was the creation of the "Puerto Rico Civic Address Standardization Initiative Technical Advisory Task Force (PRCasita)"
- Collective efforts in this arena will provide a critical contribution to the island's disaster resilience as well as help spur innovation and promote the social and economic well-being of Puerto Rico.
- **Roads to Reconstructions: Locatable Addresses in Puerto Rico** workshop was held on February 26, 2020 in Puerto Rico.
- PRAWG leadership met with the mailing community and stakeholders from municipios.
- Hosted by the *Initiative for Civic Address Systems Assessment in Puerto Rico* (iCasaPR), *Filantropía Puerto Rico* and the *USPS Postal Customer Council (PCC).*
- Standards and addressing project procedures discussed. Presentations from the PRAWG, iCasaPR and updates on addressing projects in the Virgin Islands.
- Municipal stakeholder representatives from local municipalities and subject matter experts including GIS Vendors, USPS Coding Accuracy Support System (CASS™) Certified Vendors for Puerto Rico and Open Data Experts as well as local mailers.
- Various press and media news outlets recognized the importance of the project.
- **2021 Stakeholder Meeting:** proposed next meeting is scheduled for 2021.
  - **Tentative Schedule:** Meeting to be held on March 24, 2021 in Puerto Rico.
  - 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.
- **Update on PRCave:** Solutions and ideas for improvement: "Initiate standardized training programs for all agencies that may assist developers and business users to properly enter, correct and collect addresses."
  - Currently contacting municipios on addressing issues.
  - Working with Vieques on naming hundreds of streets.
  - Implementing Federal addressing standards.
- **Next Steps:** Building synergy and connections.
  - Prepare a meeting agenda for the Spring 2021 meeting.
  - Invite PRAWG leadership.
  - Invite local government agencies and municipio stakeholders.
  - Schedule presentations and technical discussions.

NAD Content Recommendations – NSGIC NAD Content Position (Jonathan Duran, Frank Winters)

- Summary Statement
    - 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.
- Points of Justification
    - Public Safety, i.e, 9-1-1 has become a primary driver for address data. The nationwide progression towards NG911 necessitates the NENA standard
    - Using the NENA standard removes a wasteful ETL step between the NAD's source data and its final composition.
    - The NENA standard is already in wide use at state and local levels, and it is expected that NG911 implementations will accelerate across the country.
- Closing Remarks by NSGIC
    - NSGIC and our member states have a strong, vested stake in the success of the National Address Database. Our "***on the ground***" perspective on the realities of how address datasets are being created and maintained by local governments across the country has informed our recommendation that the NAD adopt the NENA standard for data format.
    - We appreciate the diligent work of the Address Theme Subcommittee and Workgroups as they advance an important national geospatial data asset, and we sincerely appreciate the opportunity to share our perspective and recommendation.
- Discussion
    - Jon Sperling – What are the cost/benefits of each standard?.
        - Jonathan – NSGIC believes that for the NAD's purposes and composition the NENA standard is just a better fit.
        - Frank – We do consider the costs and benefits. Inputs nationwide are largely in the NENA standards and many of the output uses are as well, but we would welcome a cost/benefit analysis.
    - Frank – As Steve Whitney mentioned, local governments realize there is benefit in a national database for reasons such as vendors using the NAD as their test database.
    - Steve Whitney – Another ETL would be required for local governments if we had to covert to the FGDC standard.
        - Frank – Scale is an issue.
    - Matt – Thank you to NSGIC for the response. It seems that the content recommendation is being framed as either the NENA standard or the FGDC

standard. I would submit that it is not that at all. In many cases the two standards are virtually identical. The recommendation points out the places where they are different. The recommendation is a hybrid and not meant to be an either/or choice.

- Frank – NSGIC sees the overlapping content. We agree with the content itself. The next step is to communicate to our stakeholders.
- Steve Lewis – An important point is that there needs to be one standard, and there is no room for a hybrid.
- Matt – the GDA doesn't say you can only adopt one standard. Even if the NAD is stored in the NENA standard there is no harm in saying it largely is consistent with the FGDC standard as well.

o Matt – The content recommendation says nothing about how local governments collect and aggregate data, only the minimum and optimal content. Please let us know if you think it says otherwise.

- Jonathan – It is correct that the content recommendation doesn't dictate to local governments how to aggregate and provide data. The initial idea was to provide low or no barriers to participation and we see this idea tracking with the NENA standard.
- Matt – There is no barrier to participation in our recommendation.
- Jonathan – It's a goal of ours to make sure barriers don't arise.
- Steve Lewis – there is a strong bias in the content document toward the FGDC standard. Where it becomes a problem is when DOT receives the data. There is no such thing as a trivial transformation when talking about millions of records.

o Matt – Costs and benefits is the correct lens to look at this through. Efficiency should be considered, but also accuracy and uses.

- Steve – We don't decide where data goes, we work with the provider.
- Dan Ross – I'm interested in working with the aggregator on data mapping, so I would want a relationship with the aggregator. Cost/benefit tradeoffs are what folks should think about in this discussion.

o Matt – What incentives or penalties are there for adopting the NENA standard?

- Jonathan – We have our finger on the pulse of the NG911 industry. That train has left the station. States are on that path and more will be.
- Ed – I would like to draw a distinction between data exchange and data storage and control. NENA is an exchange standard and is denormalized to allow for exchange. In that context the internal structure of the database isn't of concern.
- Andy – the 24 states are storing in the NENA GIS data model.
- Ed – even now there is an ETL process. Every dataset will go through an ETL. So I don't know that the ETL costs are as great as they seem to be.

Action Items

- Read the NSGIC position paper. Discussion will continue at the February meeting.
- Address Content Subgroup will meet and consider changes based on the NSGIC response.

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