

MetroGIS Address Workgroup

Monday, November 8, 2004

Metropolitan Counties Office Building – 2099 University Ave. W – St. Paul

Members Present: Amy Geisler, City of Ramsey Planning; Gordon Chinander, Metropolitan 911 Board; Jeff Gottstein, Woodbury PD; Peter Henschel (Carver County); Deb Jones, Falcon Heights and liaison to Address Committee of the Ramsey County GIS Users Group; Erin Naughton (Minneapolis GIS); Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District and liaison to Coordinating Committee, Lyn Rohe, Scott County PSAP; Scott Simmer (Hennepin County), and Johns Slusarczck (Anoka County).

Members Absent: David Windle, City of Roseville and liaison MetroGIS Emergency Preparedness Workgroup, Kent Tupper (Dakota County) and. John DeJung, Minneapolis PSAP

Staff Present: Mark Kotz and Randall Johnson (MetroGIS Staff Support Team)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mark Kotz called the meeting to order at 1:05 and asked each member to introduce himself or herself.

2. Approve Agenda

The agenda was accepted, as submitted.

3. Approve Meeting Summary

The summary for the September 27, 2004 meeting was accepted, as submitted, with the exception that Gordon Chinander asked that Peter Henschel be listed as the liaison with Carver County in the second to last bullet in Item 6.

4. St. Paul Address Points Data Creation

Kotz and Jones summarized St. Paul's ongoing effort to centralize 7+ address databases and establish a point database that includes all occupiable units (residential and non-residential) in the entire city as well as other types of address points. The project was initiated in large part because a significant amount of process redundancy was found, which resulted in substantial inconsistencies. In addition to building a centralized database, roles and responsibilities for its maintenance will be agreed upon.

Jones noted that the Ramsey County GIS User Group is very excited about this effort and that they believe this model will save them a good deal of time and effort as they attempt to accomplish a similar solution on a county-wide basis.

Kotz noted that St. Paul's new address points database will be demonstrated to the MetroGIS Technical Advisory Team on December 18th.

5. Review Completion Status of Work Plan Tasks

Kotz summarized the completion status of the tasks listed on page 11 of the agenda materials. He suggested, and the group agreed, that new Items labeled as Numbers 5 and 6 should be added to clarify tasks discussed at the previous meeting. He also commented that these are tasks that he intends to carry out as staff to the effort.

Work Plan

Task	Description	Completed
1	Finalize priority address-related information needs	April 7, 2004
2	Define preliminary priority mailing & situs address types , which are within the scope of this effort (e.g., occupiable units) to be refined as necessary following the interviews in Step 4d.	Tentatively April 28, 2004
3	Identify or Define data standards for the address types that are within scope.	Tentatively June 2, 2004
4	Understand how addresses are created, changed and used at different levels , (e.g. building permit application processes, county assessors, E911, parcel data, TLG, etc.)	
a	Identify the different stakeholders (i.e. various producers and users) and sources of address information	June 23, 2004
b	Define objectives for interviewing stakeholders. What do we want to learn from them.	June 23, 2004
c	Create draft address flow diagrams for each county and other entities.	See agenda item 5
d	Agree on a list of interview candidates and interview process	See agenda item 6.
e	Interview representatives from each desired perspective	See agenda item 6
f	Document existing processes for creating and changing address data by updating address flow diagrams.	See agenda item 5
5	Prepare standardized address flow diagrams	See agenda item 5
6	Compile survey results and prepare draft report with analysis	See agenda item 6
7	Identify address data that currently exist and prepare examples to look at and talk about.	
8	Define gaps between what currently exists and capabilities needed to tackle unmet address needs.	
9	Identify strategies to fill the gaps. Investigate and document the pros and cons of options to tackle unmet address-related information needs. Recommend appropriate regional strategies and best practices, including who should be involved, and roles and responsibilities.	
10	Promote understanding and use of adopted regional strategies: Proactively take measures to inform those organizations, whose responsibility it is to produce and maintain situs address records, of the value of the adopted regional strategies and promote widespread use of them.	
11	Establish a mechanism to evaluate progress.	

6. Address Flow Diagrams – Define Required Components And Standardize

Kotz noted that a diagram now exists for all seven counties, some with more detail than others. Following up on a concept agreed upon at the last meeting, he asked the group to reach agreement on a standardized set of components for each diagram.

A major topic of discussion involved how to best capture information about utilities and other “perpetuators of address data”. Discussion focused on what role, if any, they play in correcting/addressing errors/anomalies in addresses assigned by others and how best to incorporate these roles in each diagram.

Another potential address data producer category was identified as mobile homes, apartments, business suites on strip malls, and in gated/private communities. These addresses may not be created by the official addressing authority. It was agreed that the addressing authorities should be asked about how these addresses are created and provided to the addressing authority. Of particular interest are such areas where the numbering does not follow a city or county wide scheme. In addition, the rules for Tribal Lands also need to be taken into account. This is an issue only for Scott County.

Agreed upon changes to the table of responsibilities on page 12 were as follows:

- Add John Slusarczyk to the “Who” for Anoka County

- Change Gordon Chinander to Peter Henschel for Carver County
- Scott Simmer agreed to add titles of those positions that responsible for the various address related functions to the diagram for Hennepin County. (It was agreed that an objective of the diagrams is to identify distinct major functions/tasks necessary to collect and manage address data and to identify a job title for each.
- Jones agreed to put a short list of contacts together for Ramsey County. The Staff Coordinator agreed to request the participation of one or more of those persons through Commissioner Reinhardt.

The group agreed to add emergency service provides (Allina Ambulance) to the list of outputs in table of address diagram components.

It was agreed that diagrams should be prepared for the following interests in addition to one for each of the seven counties: a PSAP that encompasses multiple jurisdictions (preferably in multiple counties); cities of Minneapolis, new Market, Ramsey, Roseville, and St. Paul. Kotz noted that he would standardize the diagrams once the work to fill out each of the components is complete.

A question also arose as to what interests will be able to access the proposed county-wide/enterprise databases such as being developed by St. Paul. It was decided to acknowledge this as a Data Practices Act policy question but to relegate it to the parking lot for the time being.

7. Interview Process – Define Logistics, Roles and Questions

Kotz offered an observation that the county-by-county interview process that is currently in progress may be a more efficient way to document existing address management practices and identify gaps than would the originally proposed forums. The group concurred. It was also agreed that the interview processes must include a representative cross-section of the key interests to insure valid and supportable conclusions.

It was agreed that the interviewers questions on page 14 of the agenda packet should be modified as follows:

- Document the feedback mechanism to modify inconsistencies between actual address data and existing database records.
- What event triggers creation of a new or changing of an existing address?
- How should data verification loops be included in the diagrams?
- What does a user do if they discover an error/anomaly in an address?
- What does the custodian do if they are notified of an error/anomaly in an address? Is the database wrong or is it something else?
- Making optional asking of the “What are the mandated services...” question (the forth bullet under Databases) for each more than just database administrators.

8. Next Meeting

It was agreed that the group should set a goal of presenting a recommendation to the Coordinating Committee at its March meeting. It was agreed that to do so the diagrams need to be essentially complete and standardized by the end of January so that the Workgroup can identify gaps and appropriate strategies in February and early March. It was agreed that the next meeting should be held in early February and that staff should query the members to set the date once the agreed upon prerequisite is work essentially complete.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Randall Johnson and Mark Kotz
MetroGIS Staff Support Team