



Address (Occupiable Units) Workgroup Tuesday, July 24, 2007 MCIT Building

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kotz called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. , thanked the participants for attending, and asked each participant to introduce themselves.

Members Attending: Dave Brandt (Washington County); Amy Geisler (City of Ramsey); Deb Jones, (Falcon Heights); Peter Henschel (Carver County); Joel Koepp (City of Roseville); Nancy Read (Metropolitan Mosquito Control District); Jim Bunning (Scott County); Todd Sieben and David Brandt (Washington County); Kent Tupper (Dakota County), Ben Verbick (LOGIS); Jonathan Obermoller (City of Minneapolis); and Jeff Gottstein (Woodbury Police Department);

Members Absent: Chad Bergo, (City of Maplewood); Gordon Chinander (Metropolitan Emergency Services Board); Christine Meyer (St. Paul Regional Water Utility); Curt Peterson, (Ramsey County) and John Slusarczyk (Anoka County)

Staff Present: Mark Kotz and Matt McGuire (Metropolitan Council); Randall Johnson (MetroGIS Staff)

Visitor: Brad Henry, Member of Coordinating Committee and URS consultant to the Web Editing Application Viability Assessment Project.

2. Accept Agenda

The meeting agenda was accepted as submitted.

3. Accept Meeting Summary

The summary of the October 26, 2006 workgroup meeting was accepted as submitted. Kotz commented that since the full workgroup last met, a subcommittee had met in January to assist selecting a bidder for the Web Editing Application Viability Assessment.

4. Overview of Workplan – Address Workgroup

Kotz summarized the status of the Workgroup’s efforts relative to the workplan that the group had adopted earlier. All concurred that the Plan remains valid (no changes were suggested) and that sufficient support has been achieved to warrant moving to the next phase, which is to offer a recommendation to the Coordinating in Committee to proceed with the development of a regional Occupiable Units dataset.

5. Results - Web Editing Application Viability Assessment

McGuire summarized the assessment process which included obtaining support of the concept from the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB), hosting three forums across the seven county area and administering a survey to forum participants. He went on to state that the results of the assessment

(http://www.metrogis.org/data/info_needs/street_addresses/webedit_viability_assessment_final.pdf) demonstrate strong support for developing a regional occupiable units dataset and slightly less but

still strong support for pursuing development of a web based editing tool to help small address authorities contribute to the regional dataset as they create new or modify existing addresses as part of their day-to-day business practices. Special note was made that the St. Anthony Fire Marshall demonstrated exceptional effectiveness as an advocate for the use of GIS technology as well as support for the address points dataset.

McGuire noted that the workshop participants expressed some confusion over the custodial aspects of the proposal – who will host the application and dataset. He also stated that he and the others supporting the assessment effort had hoped for more direction from the workshop participants than was received concerning additional desired functionality. Nevertheless, sufficient direction was received to warrant moving forward.

The only change to the prototype data model for the regional dataset identified as a result of the assessment was a preference to add elevation and/or floor level information (“Z value”). The workgroup agreed that it would be good to look into modifying the draft data standard to include modification such fields with the understanding that the field(s) may not be populated in many cases, at least initially.

The group thanked Brad Henry for his assistance with the project and the Metropolitan Council for agreeing to finance the assessment via MetroGIS’s Regional GIS Project program.

6. Suggested Name Change for the Regional Dataset –“Occupiable Units” to “Address Points”

Kotz and McGuire shared with the group their observation during the assessment process that individuals affiliated with local address authorities were having a difficult time with the label “occupiable units” but seemed to more quickly grasp the proposal when referred to as “address points”.

Jones offered that the term “occupiable units” was likely selected by the workgroup at the beginning of its discussions as a means to manage the scope of the project. The group agreed with changing the name to the regional address points dataset, but also stated that the existing definition for the dataset should remain the same.

7. Recommendation to Coordinating Committee – Occupiable Units Dataset

Kotz began discussion of this topic by stating that the recommendation to the Coordinating Committee should have several components: database standards; custodial roles and responsibilities, candidate organizations to assume the desired roles and responsibilities; and a web editing application. The group concurred and offered the following direction:

a) Database standards:

- (1) Added “z” value: Concurred that the emergency response community is not the only user – they generally want the “z” value. The group concurred that a field for both floor level and elevation should be considered.

Kotz agreed to research options for recording floor level and Brandt agreed to research the standard for altitude measurement.

- (2) X/Y Coordinate Value: Agreed that a separate field should be included that could/would be automatically generated and would use decimal degrees as the standard. Verbick agreed to provide specifications. Kotz agreed to ask Chinander about this too.

- (3) Number of Attributes in the Database: The group agreed that it is important to include fields for all desired attributes in the database model and designate some as optional. It was noted that the latest draft of the database standard was created for the pilot project and the “optional” meant optional for the pilot project and not necessarily for the final dataset. It was agreed that

the workgroup should revisit the matter before the final recommendation is made pertaining to the database design.

- (4) Automated data entry and ID standard: The group concurred that to minimize data entry effort and to reduce potential for data errors, an attempt should be made to automate the creation of as many of the fields as practical. For instance, the group discussed the possibility of automating the creation of Unique Address IDs. This comment led to the discussion of a need for a regional standard and a recognition that this may be a policy matter that MetroGIS can play a role in resolving.

Suggested action: Two options for a unique ID standard were offered for testing:

- add FIPS code to the ID created by software used by the data producers
- develop a service that would assign the ID

It was agreed that if Hennepin, Scott and Carver county officials are receptive, MetroGIS should consider deferring to them to test the options and allow them to recommend an option that works best for their efforts involving compiling data from multiple address authorities.

Kotz agreed to do some additional research and look into the emerging national address standards to see how the most recent edits are handling the unique ID element.

- (5) Agreed to consider adding a field to reflect if a record constitutes a mailable address. Jones agreed to share the coding system used by Falcon Heights for the group's consideration.
- (6) LSO – Land/Structure/Occupancy Condition. Concurred that this data element should be optional because a finding of the pilot project was that this information is difficult to support and it is not a component of the emerging national standard. It was agreed that codes used by Falcon Heights should be investigated.

b) Custodial Roles and Responsibilities and Candidate Custodians:

Kotz summarized the three categories of custodian responsibilities currently anticipated. They are regional custodian, intermediate aggregator and addressing authority (primary custodian). Kotz noted that the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board are potential candidates to perform the responsibilities of the regional custodian.

Carver, Scott and Hennepin counties have decided that they have business needs to develop address point data bases and Washington County is considering the possibility. They concurred that proceeding in accordance with a regional plan for coordination is in their best interests and that they see the custodial role of Intermediate Aggregator/Custodian to be consistent with their needs.

A discussion of update frequency followed. All agreed that the regional dataset solution should, if possible, be setup to allow updates from the address authorities to be reflected in the regional dataset within one day.

c) Web Editing Application:

Johnson complimented Carver, Scott and Hennepin counties for deciding to pursue the development of an “address points” dataset, in particular their work to developed a web-based tool to assist smaller organizations with participating directly in data maintenance. He emphasized that MetroGIS would prefer to leverage the counties’ efforts and help them resolve issues important to their respective success, in other words, serve as a resource to achieve a common need. Johnson concluded his remarks by noting that MetroGIS’s goal is to share whatever code is developed with local addressing authorities and encouraged the counties to work through the intellectual property

policies before they get too far down the road with the technical implementations. If a partnership is desired, he encouraged the counties to outline their expectations.

The representatives from the counties concurred that they recognize value in leveraging MetroGIS to support a Web Application Technical Workgroup to provide advice to them as they develop their respective applications and databases. It was agreed that this workgroup should include representatives from all seven counties and LOGIS.

Read suggested that the subject three counties should be encouraged to determine if their respective efforts could be expedited or benefit from funding that might be available this fall from MetroGIS. Read commented that assisting collaborative implementation of the subject web editing application could provide valuable insight for the pending development of policies to guide MetroGIS efforts to address shared application needs – a top priority for MetroGIS’s next-generation efforts. Johnson commented that a decision needs to be made quickly in order to capture \$22-\$26,000 in the MetroGIS budget that is currently undesignated.

It was agreed that the general content for the recommendation to the Coordinating Committee for consideration at its September 12th meeting should address the following questions with as much specificity as possible at this time:

- a) Is their support to proceed with development of a regional address point dataset? Should development proceed?
- b) Should a web editing application be created and made available to help address authorities participate in the maintenance of the regional dataset?

8. Next Meeting

Kotz will contact the group to setup additional meeting times.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall Johnson, AICP
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator