

Meeting Notes
FGDC Address Subcommittee
July 8, 2020
Webinar

Attendance (30 Total):

Carl Anderson, URISA
Andrew Bailey, Department of the Interior
Florinda Balfour, Department of Veterans Affairs
Dierdre Bevington-Attardi, U.S. Census Bureau
Keri Brennan, Michael Baker International
Martin Caballero, U.S. Postal Service
Dave Cackowski, Census Bureau
Jonathan Duran, State of Arkansas
Ross Epstein, SafeGraph
Chris George, U.S. Virgin Islands
Greg Hanks, Census Bureau
Laura Hogberg, Census Bureau
Stuart Irby, Census Bureau
Christian Jacqz, State of Massachusetts
Steve Lewis, Department of Transportation
Lynda Liptrap, Census Bureau
Phil Markert, Department of Homeland Security
James Meyer, State of Arizona
Julia O'Brien, FEMA
Raúl Ríos-Díaz, iCasaPR
Karla Riso, Census Bureau
Richard Robinson, Housing and Urban Development
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Andy Rowan, State of New Jersey
Jill Saligoe-Simmel, Esri
Mikhael Schlossman, Department of Homeland Security
Joe Sewash, State of Virginia
Sean Uhl, Census Bureau
Ed Wells, URISA
Sara Yurman, Spatial Focus/URISA
Matt Zimolzak, Census Bureau

Meeting Summary

National Address Database (NAD) Updates, Steve Lewis (Department of Transportation/DOT):

- DOT is waiting for Hawaii's decision on submitting NAD data, which leaves Idaho as the only state without a status.

NAD Strategy Working Group Updates, Steve Lewis (DOT):

- The group has volunteers to work on developing a white paper.

Address Workflow Subgroup Update, Matt Zimolzak (Census Bureau):

- The group recently delivered the proposed Federal Workflow to DOT and will discuss at a future Address Subcommittee Meeting.
- The group is ready to present the second tab of the Address Workflow Validations Matrix to the Address Subcommittee.

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

- Continuing work with municipios and on sharing and combining open datasets, including structures, address, and street data.

ISO 19160: Addressing Projects and Standards, Sean Uhl (Census Bureau)

- Background of ISO Addressing project (19160 series):
 - International Addressing Workshop in 2008 agreed to create a review summary of project 19160.
- Brief description of the 19160 parts;
 - Includes conceptual model
 - Not a content or classification standard
 - Address-related info as separate classes
 - Means to cross map between different conceptual models
 - Address definition: structured information that allows the unambiguous determination of an object for purposes of identification and location
- Overview of ISO 19160 - Part 1 (Conceptual model):
 - Conceptual Schema for 19160-3: Address data quality.
- Overview of 19160 - Part 2 (Assigning and maintaining addresses scope):
 - Overall set of objectives for assigning and maintaining addresses
 - Principles for assigning and maintaining addresses
 - Best practices for assigning and maintaining addresses
 - Governance framework for assigning and maintaining addresses
- Overview of 19160 - Part 3 (Address data quality scope):
 - Profile of ISO 19157: Geographic data quality
 - Data quality elements and measures for describing the quality of address data
 - Procedures for reporting data quality

- Guidelines for the use of the established set of data quality elements and measures for describing the quality of address data
- ISO Parts 1, 2, and 3 relationships to United States Thoroughfare, Landmark, and Postal Address Data Standard:
 - ISO – Quality concepts based on ISO 19157 (profile); FGDC – Quality concepts based on CSDGM, ISO 19115 (updated since publication) and ISO 19113 (replaced by 19157 in 2013)
 - ISO – Several examples but no specific “how to” for measures; FGDC – Examples and well-formed data prep and SQL methods
 - ISO – Reporting requirements based on ISO 19115 (2013); FGDC – Reporting requirements based on ISO 19115 (2003), etc.
 - ISO – New “Completeness” terms
- Completeness methods described in ISO 19160-3
 - Developed completeness methods:
 - Boundary-based completeness methods check the address data against the specified area to which the dataset is associated.
 - Classification-based completeness methods check the address data against the specified classes of addresses or addressable objects included in a dataset.
 - Comparison-based methods check the address data unit against a reference file.
- Opportunities for use of ISO Address data quality standard
 - Similar to the FGDC Address Standard, it can be used:
 - As a framework for QC planning and processing;
 - To allocate QC tasks to different staff members or areas;
 - For incoming, outgoing, and stored data;
 - For any data quality unit (scope + measure);
 - As a type of “policy document” (i.e., part of product specifications).
- Next Steps
 - ISO 19160, Part 2 (Address assignment and management) in Stage 0
 - Expected publication within 24 months
 - ISO 19160, Part 6 (Address interchange models) in CD stage
 - Expected publication within 18 months

Content Recommendations for the National Address Database (NAD): (Address Content Subgroup)

- Dave Cackowski (Census Bureau) reviewed Table 1 of the report: Recommended NAD Data Items, and Corresponding NAD Pilot Schema Items – which items are the same, new, redefined, or dropped.
- Ed Wells (URISA) covered the address classes that are proposed for the NAD:
 - Thoroughfare Classes
 - Numbered thoroughfare addresses
 - Intersection addresses

- Two-number address ranges
 - Unnumbered thoroughfare addresses
 - Landmark Classes
 - Landmark addresses
 - Community addresses
 - Why include address classes in a content recommendation?
 - Classes determine elements: mandatory, optional, excluded.
 - Classes provide a record structure for which data tables can be designed
 - If address records also include an Address Classification attribute, the records can be QC'd to verify that they have all required elements and no prohibited elements.
- Ed then reviewed Address Elements and mandatory, optional, and prohibited classes:
 - Street Name Elements
 - Subaddresses
 - Landmark Names
 - Why include complex elements in the NAD?
 - Complex elements, along with address classes, simplify the discussion of how complete addresses are formed from simple elements.
 - Complex elements and simple elements together allow for inputs with multiple levels of parsing.
 - This lowers the barriers to entry, by accommodating practices common among data providers that do not parse their addresses completely into simple elements.
- See slides for full presentation
- Discussion
 - (Q) Raúl Ríos-Díaz (iCasaPR)– Why omit addresses that don't have geographic reference like Post Office boxes?
 - (A) Ed – they are deferred until the USPS can weigh in. It is an important use case.
 - (Q) Phil Markert (DHS)– What is an example of a four-number address range?
 - (A) Ed – Address ranges that include low-high odd address numbers and low-high even address numbers.

Action Items

- Continue to review and comment on the NAD Content Recommendations – Address Subcommittee Members.

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 11am ET.