



**Address Workgroup  
Monday, February 23, 2009  
1:00 - 3:00 P.M.  
DRAFT Meeting Summary**

**Attendees:**

Mark Kotz, Curt Peterson, Nancy Read, Gordon Chinander, Kent Tupper, Bob Basques, Sally Wakefield, Bob Moulder, Brad Roman, Ben Verbick, Deb Jones, Joel Koepp, Jim Bunning

**Item 3**

Agenda unanimously approved.

**Item 4**

Nancy Read offered an update of geocoder progress. The geocoder is up and running. Initial evaluation noted some dissatisfaction with the number of optional returns based on house number variations. Also running an alternate version for additional testing. See MetroGIS web site. <http://www.metrogis.org/data/apps/geocoder/> Landmarks (points of interest) addition to geocoder is still pending.

**Item 5**

Mark gave an update of the synchronizer project under development at Carver Co. The project is complete. Carver Co. gave a presentation about the project at the last TAT and Coordinating Committee meetings. The next step is to find a regional or state host for the Address Points data and setup the synchronization between Carver Co (and any other county that wants to be involved) and the regional or state host. LMIC is considering the possibility of being that host.

**Item 6**

Mark gave an update of the progress on development of a web app for address updating. The contract for development was awarded to Applied Geographics. The details of the contract are being finalized. It will be an ArcGIS Server based product. It may allow the newly proposed Geographic Information Office to host and open app statewide.

**Item 7**

Mark presented slides to assist in a discussion of a data distribution policy and strategy for a metro- or state-wide address database. Identifying data licensing as a major issue discussion revolved around options to license or not, sell data, freely distribute data, etc. It was noted that any data will be public information. With more than 100 address authorities, it would be unworkable to try to get everyone to agree on a common license

agreement. Yet cities may not favor giving data away freely to anyone on the web. Under any policy, a solid liability disclaimer will be needed.

Bob Moulder and Brad Roman offered a good Hennepin County perspective on licensed data and HC's position.

Nancy commented that any address database we eventually offer will also have commercial competition.

Sally offered a brief scenario of using the proposed database for mailings they do for cities. Additional discussion identified the fact that the geography of the list features is not necessary to compile comprehensive mailing lists, thus nullifying the concern for licensing of the geographic dataset for that purpose.

Curt Peterson suggested that a strategy should allow selling the dataset to private enterprises but freely distributing to government and other public agencies. Nancy extended this suggestion by offering that revenue from each sale should be divided among all participating addressing authorities proportionate to the amount of data they contribute.

An idea was suggested to not try to get all cities to agree on a single license agreement, but instead just create one good agreement and see who is willing to participate with that. Bob Basques commented that more than one license may be necessary since some participants may wish to offer no restriction of distribution and use while others will be insistent upon a license agreement and possibly a fee structure. Acquisition by private companies may then involve a fee for some portions of the data set while others would be available at no charge. Kotz noted that MetroGIS previously looked into selling data and e-commerce and decided not to go down that road.

Ben Verbick, Deb Jones, and Joel Koepp each offered brief city perspectives on the maintenance and eventual use and distribution of the address datasets. All agreed that, as an individual addressing authority, a small municipal government was probably not going to be able to "police" their own license agreement nor attempt to maintain a "fee for acquisition" procedure. Cities within Hennepin County would probably need to align themselves with the County's position on a distribution policy and strategy.

As a result of the discussion, the group concluded that it should propose a data distribution strategy that allows address authorities to participate under their choice of two scenarios.

1. MetroGIS creates a license agreement patterned after the parcel data agreement that allows MetroGIS to distribute the data only to licensed government and academic users (just like parcel data). MetroGIS would not attempt to get all address authorities to define the license agreement and would not expect all address authorities to participate. Data contributed under this license would be available via a password protected FTP site and possibly a secure web service.
2. MetroGIS would create another agreement that allows open distribution of the data on the internet to anyone. Address authorities that choose to provide their data under this agreement would have it distributed both with the password protected data and in a separate, freely available download and web service.

Additionally, MetroGIS may consider a method of charging for the protected data and providing a cut of all sales to all participants in a manner proportional to the amount of data contributed. It was noted that it is very important to approach the potential selling of the data separately from the proposal of the two scenarios above, or that effort could be significantly delayed.

Next steps include presenting this idea to the Coordinating Committee and the Policy Board. It might be best to first pitch it to city representatives on the policy board for more input. It might be wise to also have a discussion about it with emergency managers.