

Address Points Workgroup
Monday, August 17, 2009
1:30 - 3:30 P.M.
DRAFT Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Mark Kotz, Nancy Read, Todd Sieben, David Brandt, Jim Bunning, Gordon Chinander, Kent Tupper, Bob Basques, Ben Verbick, Pete Henschel, Deb Jones, Joel Koepp, John Carpenter, Curt Peterson

Item 2

Note taker - David Brandt

Item 3

Agenda unanimously approved.

Item 4

The February meeting summary was unanimously approved.

Item 5 - Committee Chair

Kent Tupper nominated Mark Kotz to serve as committee chair. Seconded by Nancy Read. Unanimously approved.

Item 6 - Regional Custodian

What organization will serve in this capacity is still undecided. In committee discussions, an organization such as Metropolitan Council or MNGeo is seen as filling this role.

Item 7 - Addition of Use Type field to database specifications

This request stems from the desire of some to identify residential addresses from commercial or other use. Deb Jones said her city uses this for doing mailings to residents, and uses an expanded version of the "Mailable Address" (Y/N) field that the workgroup added to the DB spec. in 2007.

Consensus was that the database should allow address authorities to indicate if an address is for a residential unit or not and that the inclusion of this information should be optional to the address authority.. It is unclear whether the addressing authority would be willing or able to populate or maintain this information.

The attribute of Feature Type was briefly discussed as a potential place to store this info, however, this is a national standard defined field and is really used for a different purpose. The location description field was also discussed. However, as a text field, it would be difficult to control what people use for descriptions. The Use Type field was discussed as a Y/N or integer code based field.

Action- Send specific ideas for handling residential vs. non-residential to Mark Kotz by Friday this week. Mark will compile and send back out to the group.

Item 8 - Synchronizer

Pete Henschel noted the synchronizer is completed to MetroGIS specs. However, their DBA is working on other priorities until October, at which time she could set up a demonstration. Carver County is prepared to run their end of the synchronizer, but it cannot be operational until a regional host is identified and is up and running with the other end of the synchronizer. .

Item 9 - Web Editing Application

This is awaits review by the Legal department at Met Council.

Gordy recently saw a demonstration of the Applied Geographics editing application currently in use by several cities in the Northeast which looked good.

Item 10 - Policy Board

Mark presented at the July 22, 2009 Policy Board meeting.

The MetroGIS Policy Board granted concept approval to several foundation elements for this address points dataset policy and directed the Coordinating Committee to develop a detailed policy statement and an outreach plan to advocate for widespread acceptance among leadership of “official address authorities”.

Nancy noted that while the Board asked a number of questions that this workgroup has already addressed, they were overall very supportive. Questions regarding the Return on Investment of this data were raised by the Policy Board.

Item 11 - Data access policy details

a. Nancy presented a matrix concept for the level of use/benefits with different Access Policies.

	Open Access	Limited Access
Agree to liability disclaimer	X	X
Use in public websites- view only	X	X
Use results of web services (e.g., geocoder)	X	X (probably, like parcel data is currently used)
Use web services that return points and data (WFS)	X	
Use FTP to download all/part	X	
Edit Data	Primary Custodian only	Primary Custodian only

Under the Limited option, the Policy Board recommends exemptions for First Responders (including private ambulance companies) and public safety personnel.

This opinion was shared by the Address Points Workgroup.

b. The Workgroup recommends starting with open access option as to not delay these participants any longer than necessary.

c & d. The Workgroup proposes that the Coordinating Committee come up with the liability disclaimer. The group accepted the definition of Official Address Authority as 'the government organization authorized to create or assign addresses for a particular jurisdiction.'

e. There was much discussion regarding the difference between the roles of aggregator and custodian. The aggregator was seen as more of a mechanical role of putting the data together and the custodian was seen as including a quality checking role. This language will be revisited.

12. Project Plan

Mark will revise section C for regional custodian.

13. Report to coordinating committee

Mark will revise the Recommendation section, pulling item 3 and revising item 4.

13.5

Nancy asked about using the Census address points file to assist in our efforts.

The data provided by the Census bureau was provided for purposes of updating their Master Address File and cannot be used for any other purpose.

14. Action Items

From Item 7: Send specific ideas for handling Use Types to Mark Kotz by Friday this week.

15. Mark will schedule next two meetings.