



Address (Occupiable Units) Workgroup

Thursday, December 8, 2005

1:30- 3:30 P.M.

Meeting Summary

Members Attending: Chad Bergo, City of Maplewood/Ramsey County GIS Users Group; Dave Brandt and Todd Sieben (Washington County); Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); Peter Henschel (Carver County); Joel Koepp (City of Roseville); Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council); Erin Naughton (Minneapolis GIS); Curt Peterson, (Ramsey County); Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); Scott Simmer (Hennepin County); John Slusarczyk (Anoka County); Kent Tupper (Dakota County); and Ben Verbick (LOGIS)

Members Absent: Christine Meyer (St. Paul Water Utility); Jeff Gottstein (Woodbury PD); Amy Geisler (City of Ramsey Planning); Lynn Rohe (Scott County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS Staff Support Team)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kotz welcomed everyone and asked them to introduce themselves.

2. Accept Agenda

The agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. Accept Meeting Summary

Kotz explained that no summary had been prepared for the August meeting. He noted that the group had spent most of the meeting finalizing its white paper for the GIS/LIS Conference, and the work at that meeting is reflected in the document which was reviewed by all workgroup members.

4. GIS/LIS Conference Presentation

Kotz commented that the presentation had gone well and that around 70 copies of the white paper had been distributed. He noted that no substantive concerns were raised about either the proposed data content standards or vision for a regional solution.

5. National Address Standard

Kotz commented on progress that is being made to establish a national address standard, noting that the preliminary standards agreed upon by this group had been used by the URISA-led coalition as the starting point for part of the content portion of the standard. Comments of the first draft were due early October. Following comment received at the URISA National Conference in October, the second draft was posted for comment through January 16, 2006. Kotz noted that the group working on the national address standard hopes to have the FGDC adopt a draft standard in May, 2006.

6. Work Plan Update

Kotz called to the group's attention that its adopted workplan does not specifically mention the pilot project called for in the white paper and suggested that the group officially modify its workplan to incorporate the pilot project. The group unanimously amended its workplan as such. The revised workplan is presented in Appendix A.

The group also agreed that one of the tasks to prepare for the pilot project will be to compare the draft database standard previously created by the group with the draft national standard to make sure that they are in-sync. Then the workgroups simpler standard can be used by pilot project participants.

7. Pilot Project Planning

The following purpose statements for the pilot project were accepted:

- Determine if the vision is realistic
- Define the significant implementation issues
- Develop a proof of concept

It was generally agreed that several organizations are in some stage of developing solutions for maintaining GIS data tied to unit addresses. Kotz noted that those who are attempting solutions beyond the basics should be sought out to participate in the pilot. The group concurred.

Kotz then facilitated a dialogue to better understand unit address based projects in which workgroup members are involved. It was agreed that key individuals affiliated with the following organizations (if not already members of the workgroup) should be asked to participate:

- Maplewood - Currently creating database of points for entrances of suites/units at strip centers, Maplewood Mall, office complexes, apartments, mobile home parks, etc. These points are then located spatially with the appropriate structure footprint and /or parcel. Some points created with GPS and others digitized on top of aerial photos.
- Maple Grove - similar to Maplewood's efforts.
- Chanhassen, Victoria, and Carver County Townships - similar to Maplewood's program.
- Washington County - has purchased the InfoUSA address database, which includes residential and commercial addresses derived from the white pages. County has matched these to the parcel data. It is their best source of apartment residents and number of units. The Forestry Division of DNR has also provided over 45,000 address points that they collected for fire- related emergency planning. These points can be spatially related to buildings and parcels but there is no database tie at this time.
- Hennepin County - A geocoding service (ArcIMS) tied to all parcel polygons is being developed as an enterprise solution driven by the health care mapping needs which are broader than the needs of the Surveyor's office. Currently, only primary addresses are included but County officials are seriously considering expanding the model to include sub-addresses. Thus far, 80 percent of the addresses in the county have been geo-referenced (added XY coordinate). The expectation is that the geo-referencing project will be complete in a couple of months.
- Minneapolis - some pilots to deal with areas that had been creating problems with current software but nothing widespread in the works.
- Roseville - master address database including individual units tied to PIN but the unit points are not distributed according to building or location on a parcel as is the case in Maplewood. Kotz commented that this practice would be acceptable under the currently proposed address standards. All agreed that achieving this level of effort across the Twin Cities would be outstanding.
- Ramsey County - A data model has been developed but implementation has not begun. During their testing, they discovered that use of ArcView, as a data capture tool in the field (on laptops), did not provide the desired functionality and they need to modify their expectations.
- Anoka County - On of the business units has purchased address data from InfoUSA, following Washington County's lead. The GIS Unit also actively maintains an address point file, which includes apartments, office suites, mobile home units, etc. They are also working with The Lawrence Group to update spatial accuracy of their street centerlines with new imagery.

Kotz commented that the Workgroup's effort's to promote a data standard and best practices consistent with a regional solution appears to be quite timely given all of the activity and the fact that nearly all of the efforts are in early stages where modifications can be considered. The members concurred and transitioned to talking about next steps.

The following next steps were offered by Kotz for discussion:

1. Outline roles and responsibilities of participants
2. Define a database standard based on our previous work and draft national standard
3. Contact potential participants and ask if they want to participate
4. Assist participants on converting data to regional standard
5. Evaluate pilot dataset, define key implementation issues and document
6. Get feedback from participants and document
7. Present to workgroup to develop MetroGIS regional strategy

Item 4, above, generated discussion about the need to more fully develop data specifications and participant roles and responsibilities before attempting to recruit pilot project participants beyond workgroup members. The group generally concurred that prospective participants may be reluctant to participate until they are comfortable they have sufficient resources to effectively participate. This topic also led to a brief discussion about the possibility of creating an ArcIMS application to expedite participation. Another topic talked about involved the group's response if an entity would like to participate but could only deliver a portion of the geographic extent of their jurisdiction. It was agreed, some coverage is better than none at all.

Kotz proposed the idea of creating subgroups for these tasks. Discussion followed and the consensus was to proceed with the entire workgroup and not subgroups to look into a standards, a web application proof of concept, and data flow. It was generally agreed that the following should be done:

Standards: Compare and contrast the data content standards previously developed by the workgroup against the proposed National Standard under development by URISA and deal with differences. Kotz agreed to provide the group with a copy of the most recent version of the proposed National Standard.

Web Application Proof of Concept: Need to develop a web-based application to support ongoing data maintenance and uploading to the intermediate/regional custodian. This tool needs to assist with the creation of spatial and attribute data for unit points. Chinander commented that this application will be important to the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board's (MESB) ongoing maintenance needs and, as such, he agreed to speak with MESB leadership to see if resources could be allocated to this need. It was also agreed that this new group should start with the concept that had been evolved by the previous application workgroup which suspended its work until data content standards had been established.

Data Flow: Need to clearly define where newly created "preliminary" data flows to (e.g., regional dataset) and how the sender (primary producer) will receive the "final" version once it is incorporated into a database with full integrity in terms of spatial accuracy and compliance with other standards. It was agreed the possibility exists for a master address database to evolve from this initiative.

8. Next Meeting.

Kotz agreed to query the members by email regarding their availability in January to meet. The purpose of the meeting would be to attempt to reach agreement on the database standard. It was generally agreed that if the database standards are in place, work on the application could proceed more efficiently.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

ATTACHMENT A

Work Plan - MetroGIS Address Workgroup

As Updated based on the December 8, 2005 Workgroup meeting

Purpose Statement

Respond to unmet address information needs by recommending strategies to meet those needs. This includes identifying options for meeting the need where appropriate, as well as identifying the stakeholders (producers, users, partners) related to the address information needs.

Guiding Principles

1. *Minimize duplication of effort.*
2. *Maximize consistency of data among the variety of producers and users.*

Work Plan

Task	Description	Completion
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).	Tentatively April 28, 2004
3	Identify or Define preliminary 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	
a	Identify the different stakeholders (i.e. various producers and users)	June 23, 2004
b	Define objectives for interviewing stakeholders.	June 23, 2004
c	Create draft address flow diagrams for each county and other entities.	Nov. 8, 2004
d	Agree on a list of interview candidates and interview process	Nov. 8, 2004
e	Interview representatives from each desired perspective	December, 2004
f	Document existing processes for creating and changing address data by updating address flow diagrams.	December, 2004
5	Prepare standardized address flow diagrams	February, 2005
6	Compile survey results and prepare draft report with analysis	February, 2005
7	Identify address data that currently exist.	February, 2005
8	Define gaps between what currently exists and capabilities needed to tackle unmet address needs.	February, 2005
9	Identify strategies to fill the gaps. Investigate and document the pros and cons of options to tackle unmet address-related information needs. Prepare a document that outlines issues and recommends appropriate regional strategies and best practices, including key players, and roles and responsibilities.	Vision document October, 2005
10	Conduct a pilot project to more clearly understand the implementation issues. Work with multiple address authorities that are already interested in or producing this data to create a standardized pilot dataset.	
11	Create a recommendation for MetroGIS regional strategy with roles and responsibilities and present to the Coordinating Committee and Policy Board	
12	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.	
13	Establish a mechanism to evaluate progress.	

Scope

The following types of situs addresses are within the scope of the workgroup's activities:

1. Addresses for all occupiable units, including residential and non-residential units. This includes, but is not limited to, individual apartment units, stores in a strip mall, and business suites in an office complex.
2. All "official" addresses (addresses assigned by the official addressing authority for a particular jurisdiction) that are in addition to 1 above. This might include things like parks, cell towers and loading docks, depending on the jurisdiction.
3. Information about sublocations within the addresses defined in 1 and 2 above. The purpose of this would be to define a more specific location at an address, for features within the address that do not have their own official address (i.e. a loading dock at a commercial address, a free standing garage, a barn on a farm, a pavilion at a park).

In addition, the group should work on the following address-related tasks:

1. Define an appropriate way to reference places that don't have a situs address, such as through assignment of points or coordinates or other referencing systems (e.g. intersection, mile markers) and recommend a strategy to put in place best practices for the capture and management of such data.
2. Recommend a best practice to link (move between) assigned addresses and corresponding a) vanity and alias addresses and b) landmark names that could include a variety of business and place name options.
3. Recommend procedures to translate "situs" addresses into mailing addresses and corresponding coordinates and vice versa.