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Meeting Summary

National Address Database (NAD) Updates, Steve Lewis (Department of Transportation/DOT):
  - DOT is preparing for NAD version 4, which will include:
    - New data for a few Texas counties.
    - New local data for Wyoming and Louisiana.
    - New data from the Twin Cities (MN) Metropolitan Council.
    - New data from the Rosebud Sioux.
    - Updated data from existing state partners.
    - Version 4 will be released by the end of July.
  - GISInc’s developer has moved on. Previous developer Jason Ford is available and will be joining the project again. It will be a seamless transition.

Address Workflow Subgroup Update: Matt Zimolzak (Census Bureau):
  - Group is putting the finishing touches on the Federal Workflow document and will submit to Steve for review soon.
  - Group made corrections to the State Workflow document and will present to the Subcommittee at a future meeting.
  - Group added a tab to the Workflow Validations Matrix.

Puerto Rico Address Data Working Group (PRADWG) Update: Dave Cackowski (Census Bureau)
  - The PRADWG released the Phase 2 Report: “Federal Agency Challenges in the Management of Puerto Rico Address Datasets” to the Address Subcommittee.

NAD Strategy Working Group Update: Steve Lewis (Department of Transportation/DOT)
  - The group has met twice and developed goals, including what can be accomplished in the first year. The group will send out the list of goals.

Civic Location Data Exchange Format (CLDXF) Standard Version 2 Q & A: Christian Jacqz (State of Massachusetts)
  - Review of CLDXF v2 presentation from the May Address Subcommittee Meeting:
    - Version 1 is strongly influenced by Federal standard but subaddress elements are handled differently.
    - Version 2 workgroup started in March 2018. Objectives are to specify locations precisely, consider what responders need to know, and support validation (via GIS) and dispatch.
    - Version 2 will completely eliminate landmark/subaddress distinction in favor of an expanded hierarchy of named location types. Any identifier is a “name” – proper names, arbitrary alphanumeric strings, and functional names. New location types added to handle difficult cases.
There are issues with exports from CLDXF-compliant databases to the NAD as proposed. The NAD can easily evolve to align better with CLDXF.

Questions:
- How is a boat in a marina classified? In general a marina would be a site and a boat slip would be a sub-area. ‘Structure’ has a vertical component, so a building is a structure, and a lot isn’t. A boat would be a site.
- How are mobile home parks handled? The park would be a site and the lot would be a subsite.
- Did the group go through FGDC address examples? Appendix C in the upcoming document will have a lot of examples.

Content Recommendations for the National Address Database: (Address Content Subgroup)
- Review of the scope and purpose of the subgroup and the sources and methods used.
- Results: Recommendations made for:
  - Refined NAD scope and purpose.
  - NAD capabilities needed to fulfill the purpose within the scope.
  - Content items needed for each capability.
    - Mandatory, optional, and excluded items.
  - Definitions for all items.
- Inclusions: Thoroughfare Classes, Landmark Classes
- Exclusions: Road Centerlines and TIGER address ranges, address reference system attributes, certain pilot schema, CLDXF, and FGDC items.
- NAD Capabilities.
- NAD Content: Address Elements:
  - Address Number Elements
  - Street Name Elements
  - Subaddress Elements
  - Landmark Name Elements
  - Place and State Name Elements
- NAD Content: Address Attributes:
  - Address ID, Authority and Reference System Name
  - Address Coordinates, Placement and Point
  - Address-to-address Relationships
  - Address-to-parcel Relationships
  - Additional Address Documentation
  - Address Lineage
- Proposed Changes from Pilot Project Schema:
  - Add new elements and attributes.
  - Change GUID to UUID.
  - Combine five elements into one Subaddress Element.
  - Redefine Unincorporated Community and Unincorporated Neighborhood into the Census Designated Place, Unincorporated Community Name, Neighborhood Name, and Urbanization Name elements.
Incorporate Milepost into the Address Number elements.

Drop two items: Bulk Delivery ZIP Code, Bulk Delivery ZIP Plus 4 Addition.

For elements where the FGDC definition and schema definition are the same or similar, use the FGDC definition.

- Review: Content, Capabilities, Scope:
  - We assume most reviewers will be focused primarily on specific content in the recommendation, but during the review consider the impacts to the outlined Capabilities (Section 5), and changes to the stated Scope (Section 3).
  - Content (Section 6)
    - Should any data items be redefined, or their descriptions be revised?
      - Would the changes affect NAD capabilities or scope?
      - If so, in what way are capabilities and/or scope changed?
    - Should any data items be added or dropped?
      - What capabilities would be gained/lost as a result?
      - Would the scope be expanded/narrowed as a result?

- Review Process Envisioned
  - The subcommittee chairs anticipate that review of the content recommendations will extend over 2-3 months.
  - The review will occur concurrently with other subcommittee business, including related Workflow Subgroup activities.
  - During the detailed presentation of the Content Recommendation at upcoming Address Theme Subcommittee meetings, time will be allotted for questions and discussion.
  - The chairs request that, when possible, reviewers provide written comments (or commented versions of the report).
  - This will facilitate the chairs to make decisions on the following:
    - Technical comments that need to be adjudicated by the subcommittee.
    - Agenda topic groupings to consolidate comments.

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

- Challenges:
  - Sharing Data
  - Disaster Recovery
  - Non-Locatable Addresses

- Structure Data Sharing:
  - Open data sources
  - Self-generated by different agencies
  - Non-centralized dataset
  - Unique Building Identification (UBID)
  - Working on combining open datasets:
    - ORNL Structure Data (FEMA)
    - Standardized Addresses (USPS)
- Street Data (Census TIGER)
- US National Grid
- Municipio Data Sources

Facing the Challenges
- Implement algorithms for UBID numbers.
- FGDC Standards and NAD Data.
- Provide options for locating structures.
- Create an island-wide address dataset for PR

Action Items
- Review and provide comments on the NAD Content Recommendations – Subcommittee Members.

Next meeting: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 11am ET.