



**Address Workgroup
Wednesday, October 7, 2009
1:30 A.M - 3:30 PM
Meeting Summary**

1. Attendees:

Mark Kotz, Ben Verbick, Deb Jones, Kent Tupper, Nancy Read, Dave Brandt, Bob Basques, Pete Henschel, Randy Johnson, Jim Bunning

2. Note Taker – Kent Tupper

3. Introductions

4. Agenda unanimously approved

5. September meeting summary unanimously approved

6. Finalize Database Specification - RESIDENCE

After a short discussion the group adopted the following definition and addition of the Residence data element:

Residence: Text, width = 1

Does this address have a residence or living quarters? This also includes multi-use addresses that include a residence when no other address for that residence exists in the database. This data element is **not** intended to indicate whether the residence is currently occupied. Thus apartment units would be included whether they are occupied or vacant. Values are Y, N or null. Optional.

The Unique ID element was brought up again by the group and it was decided that should be a topic for discussion at the next Address Workgroup meeting.

7. Coordinating Committee response to data ownership and access

Kotz gave a summary of the Coordinating Committee discussion on the topic of cities using county parcel points data as a basis for address points.

It raised some issues related to joint data ownership. The CC thought that cities might not be free to redistribute such data under current parcel data licenses and agreements with cities. The Coordinating Committee discussed this issue, agreeing that it made sense for cities to begin their address points by using parcel points. At the CC meeting, Bill Brown of Hennepin County said he would look for a solution to this in his county, possibly by modifying Hennepin County's parcel data license with the cities in Hennepin County to allow redistribution of certain elements..

8. Parcel data imbedded in address points dataset – Strategies for resolving distribution issues

The Address Workgroup then discussed this issue, asking for input from each of the 4 counties present at the Meeting. Carver and Washington representatives said they would have to clear this with legal departments before any commitment could be made to making address point data from parcel points available to cities for open redistribution and agreed to initiate the process. Scott and Dakota representatives didn't think sharing the information with municipalities would be a problem but would need to check on current licensing issues as well. Jones noted that she was not sure whether Falcon Heights is free to redistribute the address points data derived initially from Ramsey County parcel points. Johnson volunteered to initiate discussion with Ramsey County to see who needs to be part of this discussion since David Claypool has retired and to initiate the conversation with the new contact. Kotz volunteered to speak with John Slusarczyk with Anoka County.

The optional PIN element was discussed with regard to whether it should be entered by those doing updates or should it be done in a batch process by spatial association with the Tax Parcels. In general the group seemed to think if needed a spatial association could be made at the time a need arises (except for condominiums) and need not necessary be carried as an attribute. Randy Johnson said that there was interest expressed for this information by private interests (if the data was going to be made freely available). Tupper thought that inclusion of the PIN in the address points dataset could cause counties to have concerns about open redistribution. He said he would not recommend it for Dakota County. There was general consensus in the group that MetroGIS should not push for inclusion of the PIN element at this time because it would likely hinder efforts to make the rest of the address points data freely available and because it is an optional element.

9. Project Plan

The Workgroup created this revised work plan.

Steps to get to Initial Data Distribution – Phase 1: Simple Open Access FTP Distribution

Step	Description	Status
1	Have a willing preliminary distributor	Met Council is willing to distribute via FTP
2	Finalize draft data specifications (to be reviewed once National Standard is approved)	Unique ID item remaining, to be discussed at Nov. meeting.
3	Have MetroGIS approved disclaimer language	PB Chair Schneider and CC member Ben Verbick working on this with LMCIT
4	Get approval from CC and Policy Board to distribute data, at least for data providers that want the open access option	Draft policy statement for dataset exists, pending completion of some of the details in this list of steps.
5	Have preliminary registry of address authorities that are contributing data	Draft registry exists. Workgroup Chair Kotz is working on completing it.
6	Have accurate metadata for dataset as a whole, with link to contact info for each authority or their designated data maintainer (info in registry)	
7	Have address authorities contributing data for distribution	
8	Ensure that address authorities verify their ability to provide data for Open Access distribution as to not violate existing data license agreements	Counties & cities working on this

Steps to get to fully implementing the MetroGIS Vision: 2

Step	Description	Status
1	Have a regional custodian organization	Metropolitan Council is a willing volunteer.
2	Have synchronizer operational between 1 or more counties and regional custodian	
3	Have online web editing application operational	
4	Counties that need it get board approval to make a subset of their address points starter kit data feely available to cities with the ability to freely redistribute.	
5	Have legal issues with limited access distribution finalized (if option is wanted)	
6	Have clearly documented conditions for when a city's address points data is or is not bound by the parcel data licenses	
7	Have an outreach effort to encourage address authorities to participate	

The topic of the address authority registry was discussed. The workgroup agreed that it should include a column for the active/designated data maintainer in case it is not the official address authority. Some counties may also be the acting address authority for a city or township this is the official address authority.

Another topic discussed was how to deal with situations where other large organizations are acting as address authorities, like the U of M on their campuses or corporations on large corporate campuses like 3M. It was agreed that this situation is not fully understood or planned for in the Workgroup's address points vision. The Workgroup felt it was best to postpone this issue to some time in the future and focus on the higher priority issues at hand.

The possibility of working with other data sources such as utilities or other private companies was discussed; there could be mutual benefits, if data are complete enough.

10. Review Action Items

- Kotz create/update draft address authority registry
- County representatives check on what needs to be done to allow cities to freely redistribute address points that were or will be created initially from parcel points "starter kit".
- Johnson initiate discussion with Ramsey County about allowing cities to freely distribute address points data that were created initially from county parcel points.
- Kotz update work plan based on input from meeting

11. Adjourn