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

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

Andrew Bailey, Department of the Interior
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
Megan Compton, State of Indiana
Rodger Coryell, State of New York
Jason Ford, GISinc/U.S. Department of Transportation
John Halverson, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Ashley Hitt, Connected Nation
Steve Lewis, U.S. Department of Transportation
Phil Markert, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Jeremy McMullen, State of Vermont
Donna Pena, State of California
Alesha Perdomo, U.S. Postal Service
Raúl Ríos-Díaz, iCasaPR
Richard Robinson, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Jimmy Rodriguez-Zamora, Federal Emergency Management Agency
Karen Rogers, State of Wyoming
Dan Ross, State of Minnesota
Andy Rowan, State of New Jersey
Diane Snediker, U.S. Census Bureau
Jon Sperling, iCasaPR
Thomas Springsteen, HIFLD/Booz Allen Hamilton
Sean Uhl, U.S. Census Bureau
Marilia Valdes, Federal Emergency Management Agency
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, Steve Lewis (DOT)
- New participants:
  - Connecticut – 1,156,719 records
  - Sioux Falls, SD – 75,930 records
- ETL Updates
  - Added stand-alone Duplicates ETL to check for duplicate addresses.
  - Can now process a full dataset with each run.
  - Updates to main ETL:
    - Removed duplicates transformers and replaced with filter that reads output from the Duplicates ETL.
    - Added ability to import a predefined crosswalk.
    - Upgraded from match style to pre-mapped style transformers.
    - Performance gains in main ETL are offset by processing duplicates in a separate ETL, but the ability to process in one run rather than small batches yields better data quality.
- DOT and Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Meeting
  - DISA has been charged with creating address points for all military installations.
  - The effort is to ensure that military installations meet NG9-1-1 requirements.
  - The data to be collected will follow the NENA standard.
  - DoD is drafting policy that will require the NENA standard for addresses and centerlines.
  - The data will be shared with DOT via WFS and will become part of the NAD.
- Secretary Buttigieg Briefing
  - DOT/OCIO's Office of Data and Analytics Solutions, which houses the DOT Geospatial Management Office, briefed Secretary Buttigieg yesterday.
  - The slide deck was limited to 10 slides, but one of them was about the NAD!
- Detroit's Open Data Portal
  - Detroit has launched an open data portal that includes address points.
  - Michigan does compile statewide addresses from counties that have digital data, but the resultant data is not in the public domain because counties also sell the data.
  - Evaluating the Detroit data for NAD inclusion.
- Discussion
  - Sean Uhl – Regarding the DoD data: are they collecting the coordinates? Is the data to be shared in the NAD? Census Bureau is not able to collect military coordinates.
    - Only a subset is expected, and only for E911 purposes.
    - Military bases have been trying to sync with the existing with the 9-1-1 Master Street Address Guide (MSAG). This is a prelude to furthering GIS with address points.
    - Members agree that this is an interesting development.

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

- PRCAVE met with several stakeholders regarding Puerto Rico's address situation. In particular Urbanización Name.
- We are planning a series of conferences to discuss federal address standards, including NENA, FGDC and Postal Service and to give municipio governments access to this information. Puerto Rico addresses are fundamentally in Spanish, often with an extra line – the Urbanización Name. This creates questions about using the standards for Puerto Rico addresses. Missing Urbanización Names creates duplicates and many structures lack addresses.
- The meetings are designed to bring together federal groups, including Census, USPS, and FGDC with the municipio governments.
- Discussion
  - Matt Zimolzak – Do you have access to all documentation you need for the NENA and FGDC Standards.
    - Raul – Yes, but anything new you can forward to us.
  - Raul – Does the NENA standard have a place for the Urbanización name? We want to discuss this in the future.
    - Ed – The current and upcoming NENA standards will handle Urbanización in the unincorporated community name. Difficulty would arise when determining if Urbanización name is required, how would you indicate that? When exchanging data this wouldn't be a problem.
    - Raul – Yes, this approach would work, but with regards to quality, a stakeholder could very well not include Urbanización. We need a procedure where if Urbanización is not included, resulting in many duplicate addresses, this needs to be flagged.
    - Matt – This group is tasked with following existing standards or creating new ones, so Raul's question is very relevant and as this group goes on there will be more of a focus on standards. NENA could address this.
    - Ed – One approach would be to define a class of address that would then require certain elements. Would have to think this through.
    - Matt – The first step is to take the issue back to the NENA group and they could present how they are thinking about it at a future Address Subcommittee Meeting.
    - Ed will take issue to the co-chairs of the NENA standards group. Also, Raul offers to give a presentation to the NENA group on this. Ed will take this request to NENA group.
    - Ed – this is not just a NENA issue, but also a FGDC issue, and not just a PR issue. This issue comes up in VI, AL, MA as well.

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 Summary to Date
  - The NAD Content Proposal isn't proposing an either/or with regards to standards.
  - The proposal says nothing about how local and state governments aggregate data. It is only a recommendation of minimum and optimal content.
  - There are no barriers to participation in the recommendation.
  - NSGIC's goal is to make sure barriers don't arise, and the NENA Standard would ensure this.
  - FGDC Standard can create longer transformations for DOT.
  - Costs and benefits of each standard are the correct way to look at this.
  - There will be wide adoption of the NENA Standard by state and local governments.
  - There will continue to be significant human interaction when performing the ETL no matter what standard data is delivered in. Human interaction is lessened by working with providers.
  - There will soon be multiple NENA Standards.
- Further Discussion
  - Matt – The overwhelming number of data variables in the recommendation, required or optional, are consistent with both NENA and FGDC.
  - Dave – The Address Content Subgroup owes NSGIC written notes and comments. We will send them by early next week. We hope to wrap up the content as soon as possible, with a possible vote on the recommendation at an upcoming Address Subcommittee Meeting.
  - Matt – Think about what you want out of address data, and the NAD in particular.
  - Frank Winters – Carefully consider the voting in the spirit of the GDA.
  - Dan Ross – Think of the NAD as a national model to work for everyone. Voting members should consider this as well.

Action Items

- Questions and comments to NSGIC early next week.
- Ed wells will bring the question of Ubanizacións to NENA.

- Matt and Sean Uhl will discuss revision of the FGDC Address Standard.

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 14, 2020 at 11am ET.