



**Address (Occupiable Units) Workgroup**  
**Thursday, October 26, 2006**  
**10:00 A.M - 12:00 P.M.**  
**Meeting Summary**

Members Attending: Chad Bergo, (City of Maplewood); Dave Brandt (Washington County); Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); Christine Meyer (St. Paul Regional Water Utility); Amy Geisler (City of Ramsey); Jeff Gottstein (Woodbury Police Department); Deb Jones, (Falcon Heights); Peter Henschel (Carver County); Joel Koepp (City of Roseville); Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); Lyn Rohe and Jim Bunning (Scott County), Scott Simmer (Hennepin County); Todd Sieben and David Brandt (Washington County) and John Slusarczyk (Anoka County).

Members Absent: Ben Verbick (LOGIS) Curt Peterson, (Ramsey County) and Kent Tupper (Dakota County)

Staff Present: Mark Kotz and Matt McGuire (Metropolitan Council); 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 January 27, 2006 meeting was accepted, as submitted. Kotz explained that the long delay between meetings was due to the fact that it took much longer than had been anticipated for MetroGIS and Metropolitan Council to decide on the viability of a pilot project important to the Committee's work (Agenda Item 6) and the Council was also in the midst of evaluating the benefit it received from MetroGIS which limited his ability to spend time on committee work.

**4. Data Conversion Pilot Project Results**

Kotz explained that the purpose of the pilot was to evaluate the practicality of using the emerging National Street Address Standard to transfer data from local primary producers to the regional dataset as well as to gauge the overall viability of the regional occupiable units dataset vision from a data standpoint. Nine organizations participated – four cities and four counties and LOGIS. All of the participants concluded that the Workgroup's vision is realistic. Several challenges were identified, some relating to the National Street Address Standard and others to data elements defined by the workgroup for the regional dataset (e.g. land/structure/occupancy type). Kotz emphasized that none of the challenges is in the category of make or break but effort will be required to decide the best way to approach each.

Jones commented that she had not been able to participate in the committee's work over the past year and was encouraged to see that some of the unresolved issues with the data specifications from a year ago had been worked through. She encouraged the committee to continue to tighten up the requirements while at the same time providing as much latitude as possible to cities to address unique situations and to document why local government participation is important. Kotz stated that this pilot project provided a proof of concept for the regional dataset as well as identifying issues that will need further work to resolve. That said, a pilot dataset now exists from which to continue to mature the concept.

All agreed that a final recommendation on data specifications should be postponed until the FGDC approves a national address data standard, which is expected in the latter part of 2007. The group also agreed that it should continue to develop other aspects of the regional vision while the address standard is under review. It was agreed that the committee should proceed on the pending recommendation to the Coordinating Committee, beginning with the roles and responsibilities component (Next Agenda Item).

#### **5. Recommendation to Coordinating Committee – Regional Occupiable Units Dataset**

Kotz provided an overview of the organizational/custodial roles and responsibilities that had been previously defined by the committee, as documented in the white paper presented at the 2005 Minnesota GIS/LIS Conference. The roles associated with each major responsibility were then reviewed with the following modifications agreed upon:

Primary Custodian: The only change suggested for the responsibility was to delete reference to “all” counties in the first line and modify to state something like “... and counties which have address creation authority...”

Regional Custodian and Online Editing Application Manager: no changes

Intermediate Aggregator: add language to clarify this is an optional responsibility that is not required to achieve the vision but also include a statement to encourage counties and/PSAPs to assume this responsibility along with potential benefits if they assume this role (e.g., serve as a 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Checker” to review preliminary postings of data for possible errors before they are accepted as finalized, making clear the 2<sup>nd</sup> party checker does not have approval authority but rather serves as filter to minimize errors).

The group agreed that the existence of intermediate aggregators would foster more consistency and fewer errors. This discussion resulted in a suggestion to build a distribution component (for QA/QC) into the Online Editing protocol to foster early discussion to resolve inconsistencies before the data is “accepted”. Henchel commented that Carver County would likely opt to serve as an Intermediate Aggregator to work out early in the process any issues important to the county. Chinander commented that the process needs to support “preliminary data” postings for E911 purposes (e.g., everyone can “see” the data element which is clearly identifiable as a preliminary posting) as it is more important to have something preliminary than nothing at all when responding to an emergency. Brandt commented that supporting an efficient transition from preliminary to final data points makes the case for the importance of a unique ID. Chinander also argued for a centralized repository for the regional dataset to enable support of real-time queries. Read commented that the process should also provide with a quick loop back to the producer to report suspected errors. All agreed.

Brandt and Geisler concurred that they suspect that the proposed online editing tool may very well result in work flow improvements in addition to useful information for the participating cities. They encouraged the proposed Viability Assessment to look into this possibility. Read concurred and added that she believes that the assessment should include users beyond the address authority within cities as to benefits they might realize from the existence of this application. Gottstein commented that the functional design requirements should include “hooks” to enable the host organization to use the data themselves without defining what those uses might be. Kotz concluded that a big unknown is not the technology but whether it will be used. Defining clear benefit will be a key to success. Chinander suggested and the group agreed that an emphasis should be on web-based technology solutions because they are generally simple to learn as well as generally cheaper to support than desk top applications.

The final discussion topic involved identifying potential candidates for the regional custodian and intermediate aggregator roles. It was agreed that clear candidates for the regional custodian role

include the MESB and Metropolitan Council. LMIC was added to the list as an option to investigate in terms a preference to foster a consistent solution for the metro area that is fully integratable into a consistent solution for the state as a whole. It was agreed that candidates for the Intermediate Aggregator role included counties and PSAPs.

Data Distributor: add a clarifying comment that rules related to access to the data will be decided by the data producer(s) and that any inconsistencies with the vision (e.g., free of charge access by government interests) and/or between the producers are intended to be worked out as a matter of policy recommendations from the MetroGIS Policy Board.

#### **6. Viability Assessment – Proposed Web Editing Application**

Kotz commented that three bid proposals had been received – URS, ESRI and TIER 3. He asked for volunteers, particularly from smaller communities, the target audience for the application, to assist staff in evaluating the proposals.

Kotz noted that two key questions must be addressed by the assessment: 1) how many cities are likely to use the application and 2) what functions must the application support to secure a sufficient level of use to justify proceeding with application development. He then noted that the role of the evaluation workgroup is to assist staff in assessing which of the proposers is best able to carry out a study that answers these questions in a definitive manner. All agreed that the selection process should not preclude the opportunity for the successful bidder to participate in the development of the actual application if a decision to proceed is the result.

Geisler, Jones, Brandt and Rohe volunteered to serve on the evaluation team.

#### **7. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall Johnson, AICP  
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator