



Address (Occupiable Units) Workgroup

Friday, January 27, 2006

9:30- 11:30 A.M.

Meeting Summary

Members Attending: Christine Meyer (St. Paul Water Utility); Jeff Gottstein (Woodbury PD); Peter Henschel (Carver County); Joel Koepp (City of Roseville); Mark Kotz (Metropolitan Council); Erin Naughton (Minneapolis GIS); Curt Peterson, (Ramsey County); Lynn Rohe (Scott County) Brad Roman and Scott Simmer (Hennepin County); Todd Sieben (Washington County); and Kent Tupper (Dakota County)

Members Absent: Chad Bergo, (City of Maplewood/Ramsey County GIS Users Group); Dave Brandt (Washington County); Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); Amy Geisler (City of Ramsey Planning); Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); John Slusarczyk (Anoka County); and Ben Verbick (LOGIS)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS Staff)

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

The summary of the December 8, 2005 meeting was accepted as submitted.

4. Compare Database Design with National Street Address Standard

Kotz shared with the group progress being made by URISA to facilitate enactment of a National Street Address Standard. The goal is to complete the process by year-end. He also noted that the work of the MetroGIS Address Committee has helped to mature the proposed standard.

The group agreed that an objective of its pending pilot project should be to test the national standard and submit comments when the next comment period opens.

The group then began a field by field review comparison of the proposed national standard against the standards that it had previously defined for MetroGIS. In each case the group choose a course of action which in nearly every case was consistent with the proposed national standard. The results of this group's comparison and associated decision making are presented in Attachment A. In some cases the group elected to include National Standard database fields even if they did not appear to be relevant to address protocol in this area. This will also help test the use of the National Standard. In some of these cases, a null value and or detailed documentation will be used during the pilot. It was also agreed that once the National Standard is in place, it is likely that a few specialized data profiles will be created to conform to the needs of specific groups & purposes (e.g. 911, USPS mailing labels).

The comments that follow pertain to only those items where the material in Attachment A does not fully explain the elected course of action.

1.7.1.3 – “Upper” and “lower” unit designators for duplexes. The group recognized that this situation may not have been anticipated in the national standard and agreed that the number of characters should be expanded to six. It was also agreed that to remain in keeping with the “no abbreviation” standard throughout the remainder of the standard that these terms should also be spelled out.

1.7.1.4 – Separator Element. It was agreed that this field does not appear to be in scope for the needs of the MetroGIS community, as it does not appear to relate to occupiable units in our area. Although it appears to be affiliated with an address scheme not used in this area, the group agreed to leave it in the standard to test its possible utility as part of the pilot.

1.7.2.1 – Street Name Pre Modifier. The group felt that this element may not be relevant to this community but just in case decided to keep it with a field width of 10 characters.

1.7.2.2 Street Prefix Directional. Because the National Standard calls for no abbreviations in this element, the group agreed that in the pilot project it should test the amount and type of effort needed to comply with this. The group concurred that spelling out the directionals may cause problems with existing, main stream geocoding software. Additional processing may be required. The group acknowledged that in the future, the national standard could be very useful if the software is able to process the address data knowing it is stored in that format. All agreed that the focus should be long term, acknowledging that some conversion activity will be required during the transition to the national standard.

In response to a question from Naughton the group briefly discussed expectations for local government relative to compliance with the national standard. Johnson and Kotz stated that consistent with standard MetroGIS policy, no organization will be asked to modify their corporate database to comply with a standard desired by the community. The emphasis will be on a data transfer standard for the regional database, similar to the procedures for the regional parcel dataset.

1.7.2.3 Street Name Pre Type. The group agreed this field should be used for the pilot and that the terms “Highway” and County Road” should be spelled out.

1.7.2.4 Street Name. The types should be expanded 12 characters to accommodate fully spelled out terms.

1.7.2.7 Post Modifier. Include for the pilot and see if used.

1.7.3.7 Unit Identifier. Kotz explained this element of the standard is substantially broader than the group had previously decided. It was agreed to expand to the National Standard elements and see what happens during the pilot.

1.7.3.10 Private mail box. This element was found to be out of scope as not related to an occupiable unit. The group agreed that this topic should be placed in the “parking lot” for a possible Phase II that would address expansions of the regional dataset to address mailing related needs for things that are not occupiable units. The group agreed that the final project report needs to be clear that the primary purpose of Phase I is not to support mailing to people or organizations, but just locations and addresses of occupiable units (e.g. no post office boxes).

1.8.5.4 Address Authority. in this region.

1.8.5.5 Address Authority Identifier. The group concurred that this element of the proposed national standard does not make sense. The FIPS/GNIS codes are not meant to represent this type of entity. It was agreed to communicate this conclusion to the National Standard review team.

The group also agreed to continue to use the scheme previously agreed upon for the municipal jurisdiction identifier for MetroGIS needs.

1.7.5.9 Nation Name. Not needed by the MetroGIS community. Dropped.

Land- Structure-Occupancy Condition. It was agreed that the scheme developed for MetroGIS's needs is more complex than that proposed in the national standard and, as such, data could be produced in the national standard format if necessary. The group agreed to continue to use the scheme previously designed for MetroGIS's needs.

Comment Field. Gottstein noted that from a public safety perspective, attaching special condition information to an address (e.g., hazardous materials, life saving equipment, really, really mean dog out front, etc.) would be helpful to know before arriving at a scene. After a brief discussion of the need, most agreed that such information should be maintained separately from the address record and accessed through a join table to provide maximum flexibility. This once again highlights the importance of a stable unique ID system. The group also acknowledged that this may be an area of overlap with the CrimNet program but concurred that it is also out of scope for the current effort. It was agreed to identify this potential overlap and recommend its investigation in its final report for a Regional Address Solution for Occupiable Units.

Editing Organization. The group recognized the need to be clear about the differences between who has responsibility for data entry and editing of the data, both of which could be supported by an organization different from the data producer (source).

1.8.3.1 Address Classification. After brief discussion, the group concurred that MetroGIS's scheme is most likely "thoroughfare" based. The group discussed the relevance of the Landmark Address scheme regarding addressing for large malls but ultimately decided to continue to use the Thoroughfare scheme.

Kotz commented that he believes that once the standard is fully in place that users will be able move between the four types of address classifications to the extent they are supported by local address authorities.

1.8.5.1 and 1.8.5.2 Address Start and End Dates. Agreed not to use for the pilot project.

1.8.3.4 Address Official Status. Agreed not to use for the pilot

Kotz agreed to update the document used to facilitate this discussion to capture the elements as agreed upon the group. (See Attachment A.)

5. Next Steps.

Kotz commented that the group is now in a position to define specific tasks and support requirements for proposed pilot project. He agreed to prepare first draft and send it to the group for comment. After reviewing the draft, the group will decide if another meeting is needed.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator