

MetroGIS Address Workgroup Monday, April 11, 2005

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

Members Present: Amy Geisler, City of Ramsey Planning; Gordon Chinander, Metropolitan 911 Board; Peter Henschel, Carver County; Erin Naughton and Paul Wienberger, Minneapolis GIS; Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District and liaison to Coordinating Committee, Scott Simmer, Hennepin County; Deb Jones, Falcon Heights and liaison to Address Committee of the Ramsey County GIS Users Group; Jeff Gottstein, Woodbury PD; Dave Brandt and Todd Sieben, Washington County; Christine Meyer, St. Paul Water Utility; and Kent Tupper, Dakota County

Members Absent: ; John Slusarczck, Anoka County; and Lynn Rohe, Scott County.

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

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kotz called the meeting to order at 10:05 and asked each member to introduce him or herself.

2. Approve Agenda

The proposed agenda was accepted, as submitted.

3. Approve Meeting Summary

The summary for the March 16, 2005 meeting was accepted, subject to changing reference to the many-to-one relation enhancement in the last paragraph of item 6 from “proposed” to “in progress”.

4. Overview of Next Steps

Kotz summarized progress made to achieve “next steps” previously identified by the group and listed on pager 5 of the agenda materials and asked if anyone wished to offer any desired changes. The group agreed to the activities as set forth in the agenda materials and that the next milestone would comprise a “white paper” that documents detailed data specifications, custodial roles and responsibilities necessary to create and maintain the specifications, and explains desired next steps to include a possible pilot proposal to test and refine design assumptions.

5. Report on March 30th Coordinating Committee Action

The MetroGIS Staff Coordinator informed the workgroup that the Coordinating Committee had accepted the workgroup’s vision as proposed and that it will be shared with the Policy Board as an information item on April 20, 2005. Member Read, who also serves as the Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, shared her thoughts about the Committee’s positive response to the proposed vision. She also passed along the Committee’s support for the workgroup’s efforts to work through roles and responsibilities necessary to maintain data currency and to keep in mind a need to communicate the benefits to local government producers of address data.

Kotz and Chinander summarized the relationship between this workgroup and the E911 Street Centerline Workgroup which also received Committee endorsement of its vision at the March 30 meeting and in particular the relationship that is being sought with the 27 PSAPs (Public Safety Answering Points) that serve the seven county area.

6. Define Custodial Roles

As a refresher, Kotz summarized the major components of the vision as presented to the Coordinating Committee. (See the *March 30, 2005 Report to the Coordinating Committee* at http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/add_wkgrp.shtml for a listing of the specific components.) Kotz then facilitated a discussion to reach agreement on the major organizational (custodial)

roles that the group contemplates will be need to achieve the vision (some specific design objectives and related responsibilities were also identified which are listed following the respective major roles):

- **Primary producer** – addressing authority for each distinct area of geography (e.g., cities)
 - ✓ The system design needs to incorporate a link to parcel data.
 - ✓ Quality control would remain the responsibility to the local producers, as it is currently. No changes to the data would be made by an intermediate aggregator or regional custodian.
- **Intermediate aggregator** – entities that aggregate data produced by primary producers at the sub regional level (e.g. LOGIS, counties, PSAPs, etc)
 - ✓ Point out anomalies in the data to the primary producer.
- **Regional Custodian** – preferably an organization with a business need for a solution that encompasses the entire seven county area for the subject information need as well as the capacity and willingness to serve ion this capacity (e.g., Metropolitan E911 Board)
 - ✓ Point out anomalies in the data to the primary producer.
- **Online Editing Project Manager** – an organization that has the capacity and willingness to provide the hardware, software, and technical support for the envisioned on-line application. Need not be the same as the Regional Custodian. (e.g. private vendor, Met. Council)
 - ✓ Distributed editing functionality is required to achieve purpose
 - ✓ Incorporation of minimal hardware/software requirements on user end may be cost effective means to demonstrate benefit of participation to local producers
- **Data Distributor** - an organization that has the capacity and willingness to host the distribution mechanism if MetroGIS Data Finder is not suitable for the breadth of anticipated distribution needs pertaining to the subject data.
 - ✓ Assume that distribution of the entire dataset for updates, as is currently the practices for the regional parcel and street centerline datasets, will continue to be the most efficient practice.

The group spent time talking about the need to define and communicate benefits to local government to actively participate in the anticipated “primary producer” role. Benefits cited were as follows:

- **Improved organizational efficiencies** -
 - ✓ Ability to very quickly be able use (fast path) data each producer puts into the system even if very limited technical capabilities on their end (e.g. mailing label application and other web based applications designed to automate every day work functions).
 - ✓ Ability to automatically populate standard forms with address data already in the system to expedite new permit issuance.
 - ✓ Ability to use in emergency response functions of local government.
 - ✓ Ability to quickly use address data that is produced by adjoining jurisdictions as a result of maintaining in a commonly agreed upon standardized format and transfer standard.
 - ✓ Reduced redundancies in data capture and maintenance
 - ✓ Ability to automate distribution to major users of the data within and outside of the producer organization (e.g. school districts, state precinct finder).
- **Improved data accuracy** –
 - ✓ Ability to greatly minimize or eliminate future inconsistencies with other organizations as address authority’s source address data are distributed.
 - ✓ Provides a larger pool of users who may be able to identify anomalies and provide feedback.

Finally, it was generally agreed that the workgroup should consider a pilot project to refine the system design and associated roles and responsibilities. During a pilot, strategies could also be refined to secure buy-in from all key stakeholders and refine the workgroup’s understanding of the data distribution paths. Piloting of the proposed Web-based application may also serve as an effective outreach tool to demonstrate the benefits of the proposed envisioned regional system.

Staff was asked if there are any comparable efforts else where in the country from which the MetroGIS community might learn. A project in Cincinnati was suggested for investigation as was an effort in Chester County, PA. Those members agreed to follow-up with those efforts. In addition, it was noted that in the

Twin Cities, that Chanhassen is nearly finished with the development of a dataset similar to that envisioned for the Metro Area and that several communities in the Ramsey County GIS Users Group have been talking about development of county wide unit based database for some time. These local efforts were acknowledged as possible participants in a pilot to refine the regional strategy.

7. Conceptual Database Design – Adding Details

Kotz summarized existing standards that the workgroup had previously reviewed and which relate to the workgroup's charge (e.g., NENA protocol for addressing, MetroGIS addressing guidelines, MetroGIS address standard for parcel data, and the U.S. Postal Service's Publication 28).

The group concurred with the following general needs:

- ✓ The group needs to have a thorough understanding of the business needs (purpose) for the proposed occupiable unit data. Staff concurred noting that the group's work should focus on the address related information needs identified by MetroGIS participants in 1997 and shared with the group when it first began meeting. It was agreed that the E911 community's needs may not be sufficiently detailed in the 1997 study but that the Metropolitan 911 Board's involvement at this time should provide any desired supplemental information.
- ✓ A standard for a unique identifier for each occupiable unit address needs to be considered.
- ✓ An MSAG compliance/conversion capability is a must.
- ✓ Identify all current impediments to achieving MSAG compatibility.
- ✓ Flexibility will be needed to accommodate varying spatial accuracies of occupiable unit points.
- ✓ Topological structure will be a key issue with respect to multi unit buildings. There was an acknowledgement that the database could accommodate such features in two ways. One being with individual points and the other being with one point and a related table for multiple units. In the case of the former, permitting the points to stack upon one other in the database structure will be necessary.
- ✓ It may be prudent to operate a test environment for possibly 6-12 months, before attempting to use a production environment with the emergency response dispatching community.

The group discussed the idea of having the E911 Street Centerline Workgroup take the lead on address standards that relate to street centerlines (e.g., street naming and address ranges).

The group agreed to create the following subgroups that would both meet prior to the next full workgroup meeting tentatively scheduled for early May:

<u>Subgroup</u>	<u>Member</u>
1) Database Structure/Standards	Gordon Chinander Erin Naughton Christine Meyer Scott Simmer <i>(Suggested - Curt Peterson with Ramsey County)</i>
2) Web Editing Application	Deb Jones Scott Simmer Todd Sieben Peter Henschel Kent Tupper

Kotz agreed to set up times for both subgroups and provide lead staff support.

Finally the group agreed that options should be documented with pros and cons that when appropriate, policy matters (securing custodian resources, resolution of impediments related to existing procedures, etc.) should be framed for consideration and direction from the Policy Board. Also, an attempt should be made to outline benefits that might accrue from recognizing the US Census Bureau's protocol to capture the coordinate of unit entrances..

8. Call for Regional GIS Project Funding Proposals

Kotz explained that a call is currently out to all workgroups for funding proposals involving GIS projects with regional significance. He noted that \$22,000 is available for this purpose in the 2005 MetroGIS budget and that the deadline for submittal is May 18. Staff was asked to forward the funding guidelines to the members.

9. Next Meeting

The group asked staff to set up a meeting in early May.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

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