<u>Meeting Notes</u>
FGDC Address Subcommittee
June 10, 2020
Webinar

<u>Attendance (32 Total):</u>

**Andrew Bailey**, Department of the Interior
**Florinda Balfour**, Department of Veterans Affairs
**Dierdre Bevington-Attardi**, Census Bureau
**Dave Cackowski**, Census Bureau
**Jonathan Duran**, State of Arkansas
**Monique Eleby**, Census Bureau
**Ross Epstein**, SafeGraph
**Michael Fashoway**, State of Montana
**Laurie Flaherty**, Department of Transportation
**Liz Flake**, U.S. Postal Service
**Chris George**, U.S. Virgin Islands
**Laura Hogberg**, Census Bureau
**Christian Jacqz**, State of Massachusetts
**Steve Lewis**, Department of Transportation
**Phil Markert**, Department of Homeland Security
**Jeremy McMullen**, State of Vermont
**James Meyer**, State of Arizona
**Julia O'Brien**, FEMA
**Christopher Portell**, FEMA
**Raúl Ríos-Diaz**, iCasaPR
**Karla Riso**, Census Bureau
**Richard Robinson**, Housing and Urban Development
**Karen Rogers**, State of Wyoming
**Dan Ross**, State of Minnesota
**Jon Sperling**, iCasaPR
**Thomas Springsteen**, HIFLD/Booz Allen Hamilton
**Marilia Valdes**, FEMA
**Ed Wells**, URISA
**Martha Wells**, Spatial Focus/URISA
**Jonathan Wolf**, SafeGraph
**Sara Yurman**, Spatial Focus/URISA
**Matt Zimolzak**, Census Bureau

## 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.

- o 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:
  - o 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.
  - o How are mobile home parks handled? The park would be a site and the lot would be a subsite.
  - o 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:
  - o Refined NAD scope and purpose.
  - o NAD capabilities needed to fulfill the purpose within the scope.
  - o Content items needed for each capability.
    - ▪ Mandatory, optional, and excluded items.
  - o 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:
  - o Address Number Elements
  - o Street Name Elements
  - o Subaddress Elements
  - o Landmark Name Elements
  - o Place and State Name Elements
- NAD Content: Address Attributes:
  - o Address ID, Authority and Reference System Name
  - o Address Coordinates, Placement and Point
  - o Address-to-address Relationships
  - o Address-to-parcel Relationships
  - o Additional Address Documentation
  - o Address Lineage
- Proposed Changes from Pilot Project Schema:
  - o Add new elements and attributes.
  - o Change GUID to UUID.
  - o Combine five elements into one Subaddress Element.
  - o Redefine Unincorporated Community and Unincorporated Neighborhood into the Census Designated Place, Unincorporated Community Name, Neighborhood Name, and Urbanization Name elements.

- o Incorporate Milepost into the Address Number elements.
- o Drop two items: Bulk Delivery ZIP Code, Bulk Delivery ZIP Plus 4 Addition.
- o For elements where the FGDC definition and schema definition are the same or similar, use the FGDC definition.
- Review: Content, Capabilities, Scope:
  - o 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)**.
  - o **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
  - o The subcommittee chairs anticipate that review of the content recommendations will extend over 2-3 months.
  - o The review will occur concurrently with other subcommittee business, including related Workflow Subgroup activities.
  - o During the detailed presentation of the Content Recommendation at upcoming Address Theme Subcommittee meetings, time will be allotted for questions and discussion.
  - o The chairs request that, when possible, reviewers provide written comments (or commented versions of the report).
  - o 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-Diaz (iCasaPR):
- Challenges:
  - o Sharing Data
  - o Disaster Recovery
  - o Non-Locatable Addresses
- Structure Data Sharing:
  - o Open data sources
  - o Self-generated by different agencies
  - o Non-centralized dataset
  - o Unique Building Identification (UBID)
  - o Working on combining open datasets:
    - ▪ ORNL Structure Data (FEMA)
    - ▪ Standardized Addresses (USPS)

- Street Data (Census TIGER)
- US National Grid
- Municipio Data Sources
  - o 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.