



**Address Workgroup
Wednesday, September, 2009
9:30 A.M - 11:30 A.M.
Meeting Summary**

1. Attendees:

Mark Kotz, John Slusarczyk, Ben Verbick, Deb Jones, Todd Sieben, Brad Roman, Gordon Chinander, Kent Tupper, Bob Moulder, Nancy Read, Dave Brandt, Curt Peterson, Bob Basques, Pete Henschel, Joel Koepp

2. Note Taker – John Slusarczyk

3. Introductions

4. Agenda unanimously approved

5. August meeting summary unanimously approved

6. Regional Custodian Update

Kotz stated that Met Council is willing to be the regional custodian.

7. Update on National Standard

Kotz noted that National Standard update appears to be close to going to the FGDC at which point it will be sent out for public review which could possibly take one year. If possible, Kotz will distribute a draft of the standards to the workgroup once they have been sent to FGDC.

8. Web Editing Application

Funding was approved by Met Council last year and Applied Geographics is standing by. Met Council is waiting for approval from their legal department to begin work.

9. Adding Residential vs. Non-Residential Info to Data Specifications

Kotz revisited past discussions of possibly combining the mailing code and residential/non-residential fields into one. He then suggested a “Residential Unit” or “Residential” field that would have a Y/N value.

Some debate occurred over the actual name of the field. Suggested field names included “Has Residence” or “Dwelling.” The group eventually agreed that “Residence” is suitable as long as the field definition adequately explains that field is not intended for “addresses without a structure” and recognizes that making this distinction may be above and beyond the normal work flow of most addressing authorities.

Kotz agreed to modify the proposed new attribute based on the discussion and submit it for approval at the next meeting.

10. Should We Add Feature Type Attribute?

Discussion regarding the “New National Standard Definition” of this field occurred with emphasis on the fact that the domain of values to be used should be defined locally. Kotz suggested that if this field were included that we would establish a MetroGIS domain of values.

Jones said that her city would find this field useful for differentiating between addresses for large buildings or complexes and individual units within the building (address for whole strip mall or apartment building vs. for an individual store or apartment). Koepp said that his city might use it to identify tornado sirens, electrical boxes, etc. A lengthy discussion occurred about possible uses of the field. Some potential uses were found to already be covered by existing fields in the standard.

The group concluded that there is considerable confusion about what would be included in this field and the likelihood of it being populated by many address authorities and in a consistent way seemed low. Because of this, the group ultimately decided to not include the “Feature Type” field unless it is identified as a need by the addressing authorities in the future.

11. Project Plan

Kotz stated that Met Council is ready to make points data available via FTP, but that the project still needs several steps to occur.

Discussion occurred as to how the data would be distributed (openly vs. licensed) and whether or not data contracts between the counties and cities would be breached. Kotz suggested formulating questions regarding data distribution and presenting them to the Policy Board.

Read suggested some outreach to the cities to get them involved in the project.

An unresolved question: If a city’s address points dataset was created from parcel points in some way, can it at some point be considered a completely separate dataset and not be bound by the parcel license agreement? If so, what are the conditions for that to happen? Do different counties have different views on those conditions? How does the parcel ID fit into this? This is an important question to be resolved.

The group agreed on these project plan steps:

Phase 1 – Simple Open Access FTP Distribution

- Have a willing preliminary distributor (Met. Council willing to distribute via FTP with quarterly updates)
- Get approval from Policy Board to distribute data, at least for data providers that want the open access option
- Have MetroGIS approved disclaimer language
- Finalize draft data specifications (to be reviewed once National Standard is approved)
- Have preliminary registry of address authorities that are contributing data
- Have address authorities contributing data for distribution
- Ensure that address authorities verify their ability to provide data for Open Access distribution as to not violate existing data license agreements.

Phase 2 – Fully Implementing the MetroGIS Vision

- Have a regional custodian organization
- Have synchronizer operational between 1 or more counties and regional custodian
- Have online web editing application operational
- Have legal issues with limited access distribution finalized (if option is wanted)

- Have clearly documented conditions for when a city's address points data is or is not bound by the parcel data licenses.
- Have an outreach effort to encourage address authorities to participate

12. Review Action Items

Kotz would modify the proposed new attribute based on the discussion and submit it for approval at the next meeting.

Bob Basques would send the group a link to statute that talks about distributing data from modified datasets.

13. Adjourn