

## **MetroGIS Address Workgroup** **Monday, June 20, 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); Chad Bergo (Maplewood) for Deb Jones (Falcon Heights and liaison to Address Committee of the Ramsey County GIS Users Group); John Slusarczyk (Anoka County), Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District and liaison to Coordinating Committee); Scott Simmer (Hennepin County); Lynn Rohe (Scott County); and Dave Brandt (Washington County).

Members Absent: Christine Meyer (St. Paul Water Utility), Kent Tupper (Dakota County), Erin Naughton, (Minneapolis GIS); Jeff Gottstein (Woodbury PD); Todd Sieben (Washington County); and Ben Verbick (LOGIS and Liaison with Street Centerline Workgroup).

Staff Present: Mark Kotz, Michael Dolbow (E911 Compliant Street Centerline Workgroup) and Randall Johnson (MetroGIS Staff Support Team)

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Kotz called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and asked each member to introduce himself or herself. Kotz also informed the group that Deb Jones is undergoing medical treatment and that Chad Bergo has agreed to fill in for Deb. Kotz arranged for a group photo and get well message.

### **2. Approve Agenda**

The following items were added to the preliminary agenda: 3a – Update on National Address Standards initiative that is being facilitated by URISA and 4a – Revisiting of Address-specific Information Needs. The agenda was accepted, as modified.

### **3. Approve Meeting Summary**

The summary for the May 31, 2005 meeting was accepted as submitted, with the exception that it was noted that Todd Sieben should be shown as attending as opposed to absent.

### **4. National Address Standard Initiative – URISA Facilitating**

Kotz and Dolbow explained that the URISA (Urban and Regional Information Systems Association) has been sanctioned by the FGDC (Federal Geographic Data Committee), to facilitating a national address data standard. They noted that MetroGIS has been invited to participate in the effort. The Workgroup's efforts to define address database components will be used as part of the foundation of the content portion of the national standard. An interactive web site is being used to track modifications offered to the draft standards as they are matured. A clear timeline for URISA's completion of this work is not yet available.

### **5. White Paper Outline**

Additions and modifications to the outline agreed upon were as follows:

a. The reader must be made aware that this is preliminary work. It would be good to have a disclaimer in the white paper similar to the following – “The conclusions and recommendations set forth in this document are based upon the first round needs assessment conducted by MetroGIS in 1996-97 and knowledge of changes in these needs as understood by the workgroup members. They are therefore considered to be preliminary, subject to modification following testing to insure consistency with current user needs.”

b. Add a clear purpose statement that identifies both the reasons for the White Paper and the intended audience. The group agreed that in general the purpose of the document is as an outreach vehicle to explain the vision (concept/objectives), implementation components thus far agreed upon, issues that remain to be addressed and why not yet addressed, and the benefits that would be realized by the participating producers of the desired source data. In short, would participation result in more efficient, effective government, particularly concerning local units of government? It was agreed that reasons for current city efforts to

create address point databases should be solicited and included in the White Paper. Bergo agreed to submit the reasons for Maplewood's efforts and Henschel agreed to speak with the City of Chanhassen to document their reasons. It was agreed that these reasons need to be reinforced throughout the document.

c. A section should be added close to the front of the document to explain the relationship between this project and URISA's initiative to define a national address standard. A suggestion was made to excerpt several of the objectives that are included in URISA's press release. Also, include the relationship to PSAP's, as well as how other governmental units – schools, watersheds, state, etc – would be able to leverage the investment in a regional address point database.

d. Section 2.1. Member Read offered several information needs that the groups thought should be included in the list of information needs –

- (1) Enter the data once to enable efficient and coordinated distribution to others who need it.
- (2) Ability to check addressing scheme in the adjoining communities when assigning names and numbers. (This outcome implies that a standard format is widely endorsed and used)
- (3) Ability to generate mailing lists
- (4) Cascading geocoder – begins with unit points, goes to parcels and then street centerline to locate an address. The role of geography? to make this happen should be stressed and how services can be improved with such a tool.

e. Section 4.1. It was agreed that the “do nothing” option should not be listed first but rather the option best aligned with the vision that has been endorsed by the Policy Board.

f. Section 4.1.4. Substitute “non-address authority maintenance option” for the “bad idea” clause. Okay to conclude in this section not a good idea provided the facts support this conclusion but the conclusion should not be included in the title.

g. Section 4.3.2. The group concurred that the section describing the technical design specifications should probably be moved to an appendix and that only an overview should be presented in the main document.

h. The concept of adding a glossary was discussed. It was agreed to try the option of defining terms in the section in which used as the first option. If need be a glossary will be given further consideration.

Kotz agreed to develop a preliminary draft from which others would expand upon. Chinander, Brandt, and Slusarczyk volunteered to assist Kotz with the drafting of the document.

## 6. Database Design Decisions

The group started where it left off at the May 31<sup>st</sup> meeting – Page 8 Unit Identifier.

### a) Unit Identifier:

The workgroup agreed that two fields will be provided based USPS standards. The first field would include Unit Type, using either the standardized abbreviations or the spelled out unit type option as listed in the staff report. If a non-standard abbreviation is attempted the system would not accept it. The second field would be to be used for the Unit Number, including subunit designators such as 34B.

The user would have the ability to place both types of information in the first field. The group agreed that it would be desirable not to permit the mixing of the data (data from both field types all in the first field) but ultimately agreed that flexibility will be needed to encourage participation.

It was also agreed that the standards need to include “business rules” that state how the fields should be populated. E.g., the “floor” Unit Type is not to be used unless there is no room number.

b) City and Township Names.

Best practices for the situs address agreed upon were: use the FIPS Place code for the “code” field and spell out the name in upper case in the “name field”. It was agreed that there is no need for a Mailing City Code but there is reason to include the Mailing City Name.

It was agreed that provision of the domain of names should be pursued as a best practice and that the approved list of names be developed by asking each community for their preferred spelling. The 30-character field was deemed acceptable but should be revised once the domain is finalized. The task of establishing the domain of approved names should be started by creating a listing from the regional database(s) and asking the communities to offer any desired changes.

c) Parcel ID

The group concurred that a Parcel ID should be included in each record but that some records might not have a parcel ID in cases where the unit point data is created prior to the parcel data being finalized and available.

The group also agreed that a business rule will need to be created to uniformly decide which parcel to assign the building address in situations where multiple parcels (with separate tax/legal descriptions) comprise a single building site.

**7. Next Meeting**

No date was set for the next meeting

**8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

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