



**Address Workgroup**  
**Thursday, December 17, 2009**  
**10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon**  
**Meeting Summary**

**1. Attendees:**

Mark Kotz, Chad Reilly, Kay Simons (for Gordon Chinander), Deb Jones, Todd Sieben, Kent Tupper, Jim Bunning, Ben Verbick, Bob Moulder, Brad Roman, Curt Peterson, John Slusarczyk, Bob Basques, Nancy Read

**2. Note Taker** – Ben Verbick

**3. Introductions**

**4. Agenda approved**

**5. November meeting summary approved**

**6. Project Plan Steps Review latest version**

Kotz read the current phase 1 project plan. There was no discussion.

**7. Liability Disclaimer**

Verbick offered a brief status update of the liability disclaimer. On behalf of the workgroup Verbick contacted the Minnetonka city attorney and mayor to ask that they request assistance from the League of MN Cities Insurance Trust to draft a disclaimer and offer advice on use and presentation. The LMCIT has accepted the task and the request is being reviewed by Mr. Chris Smith, a LMCIT risk management attorney. Mr. Smith has not committed to a completion date for the product.

**8. County/City Data Ownership Updates**

Moulder offered his perspective on ownership of address points and reiterated concerns of Hennepin County Commissioner, Randy Johnson. He said that Hennepin is holding off on pursuing changes to their license agreement with cities because of the possibility of an FGDC CAP grant funded study on the economic return of making parcel data freely available. Of primary interest to Commissioner Johnson is whether an address points dataset would have a general economic impact within the County.

Ramsey County has a rather unique partnership and joint powers agreement with members of the Ramsey County GIS Users Group (RCGISUG). The County and user group cost share in a number of items including aerial photography and planimetric updates whereby UG members gain free access to parcel, half sections and other data sets. The RCGISUG would need to formally approve any further dissemination of address point data to non-members. Also, Ramsey County Management would need to approve providing address point data for use in this project as it is somewhat conflicts with the GIS fee based model we currently utilize.

Kotz provided further information about the plan to apply for a CAP grant to study this topic.

**9. Unique ID Elements – Final Format in Data Specifications**

Kotz reviewed language changes to the data specification and recommended appropriate usage for the unique ID. Bunning asked if there were unique ID compatibility concerns with the national standard, particularly a need for persistence of the ID. Kotz responded that there is no persistence requirement in the draft national standard.

Action: Kotz's proposed wording for the unique ID description was approved by the workgroup.

**National Address Unique Identifier, Text, width 60**

**Local Address Unique Identifier, Text, width 50**

1.8.1 Address ID:

Each address record must have a unique ID. This will distinguish it from any other record in the local or national database. It will also allow other datasets to be related to the address database (e.g. landmark names, contact phone number, existence of lifesaving equipment/defibrillator, existence of hazardous waste, etc.).

**Local vs. National Unique ID**

Each unique official address authority that participates in the MetroGIS Regional Address Dataset must maintain a unique identifier for each address point record. The formatting and structure of that unique identifier is completely at the discretion of the local address authority as long as the ID can be converted to a 50 character text field in the MetroGIS dataset without losing its uniqueness. Because it is envisioned that this data will someday be used at a state or national level, it is desirable to have a nationally unique address ID in the MetroGIS regional dataset. This will be accomplished by appending the GNIS unique ID (in the 8 character text with leading zeros Census format) and a dash to the beginning of the local unique ID. . It must be stressed that the GNIS code in the unique ID is meaningless.

**Permanence Recommendations**

The following are recommended by MetroGIS, but are not required to participate in the Regional Address Points Dataset. Unique IDs should not be reused if they are retired. Unique IDs should not be changed unless there is a change to the geographic feature (occupiable unit) itself. For example, if a street name changes, the street name field of the address record should change, but not the unique ID. If the parcel in which the unit resides is split and the parcel receives a new parcel ID, the unique ID of the address point should not change. If an annexation causes an address point to change jurisdiction from one city or township to another, it is desirable that the unique ID remain the same. It is realized, however, that this may place a burden on local address authorities, especially in the last example. Each address authority will need to determine for itself to what degree it should adhere to these recommendations.

**10. "Occupancy Type" vs. "Subaddress Type"**

Kotz noted that the draft national standard has changed the terminology of "Occupancy Type" to "Subaddress Type" and asked the workgroup if our standard should also reflect the change. Roman asked if the national standard is continuing to move forward. Kotz reported that there is progress being made, but no clear timeframe on the national level.

Action: The workgroup approved the change or wording from "Occupancy" to "Subaddress".

**11. GNIS ID Format – USGS Integer vs. Census Text**

Kotz referenced page 4 of the agenda packet and reviewed the history of GNIS ID discussions and the differences between Census Bureau and the USGS formats. Kotz noted that either standard is acceptable at both the state and federal level and that the text format will allow for leading zeros. Following a brief discussion Kotz suggested adopting the GNIS text format used by the Census.

Action: The workgroup approved adoption of the GNIS text format.

**Municipal Jurisdiction Code: Text width = 8**

The official federal Geographic Names Information Systems unique identifier code for the jurisdiction in which the address is physically located. (MetroGIS calls this the “CTU” identifier.) See Appendix A for list of values. Note: leading zeros are required.

## **12. Authority and Source Attributes**

Kotz referenced page 5 of the agenda packet and reviewed the usage of “address authority”, “address direct source” and “editing organization” fields in the proposed standard. He noted that the draft national standard has re-visited these fields and has dropped the Address Direct Source field. Kotz suggested that the workgroup also drop the Address Direct Source field. Moulder argued that the field has historic value. Basques and Jones also noted uses such as independent addressing authorities within municipal jurisdictions (State Fair, U of M). Additional discussion followed.

Action: The workgroup will keep the Address Direct Source field and Kotz will note the variation from the national standard.

## **13. XML Tags**

Kotz reviewed the topic background and noted that the group must decide how to separate the two <address ID> tags. The workgroup also must consider the inclusion of the <SubAddressType> tag. Basques suggested <MNAddressIDLocal> for the second ID tag in keeping with the syntax of other local tag naming conventions.

Kotz also asked that the workgroup take action on Jurisdiction tag and state name tag.

Action: The workgroup approved <MNAddressIDLocal> and continued inclusion of <SubAddressType>. The jurisdiction tag will be <MNMuniJurisdictionCode> and the <StateName> tag will remain as is.

Basques introduced a brief discussion about county and municipal name formats and the use of pick lists for data entry. Read suggested that formats should be defined. Moulder noted variations of common formats that have been adopted by public safety dispatch.

Action: None. Tabled for later discussion.

## **14. Metadata for Phase I Regional Dataset – Preliminary draft**

Kotz introduced a draft metadata document noting that Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines were used to compile the document and he patterned it on typical Met. Council and MetroGIS metadata records. Several gaps in the metadata narratives were discussed and wording and/or links were suggested. Basques asked if USNG can be considering for bounding coordinate values. Kotz offered that Lat/Long in decimal degrees are a metadata standard for the bounding box element at both the state and national level.

A discussion of the lineage statement in the metadata document followed. The documented process is yet to be determined.

Action: Kotz will edit the draft metadata document as discussed and distribute to the workgroup for approval.

## **15. Regional Custodian Validation of Data**

Several questions were directed to Kotz in reference to address data validation and maintenance. Roman: How will duplicate addresses be verified by the data aggregator? Kotz: The aggregator would notify the sender of the duplication. The sender would have the option to change or approve the duplicate. Read: Why worry about rejecting a dataset for duplicate addresses? Flag as duplicate but don't reject. Peterson: There are instances when duplicate addresses are valid. Simons: Will discuss duplicate address concerns in CAD systems with Chinander.

Kotz stated that these decision are to be made by the Address Workgroup and prompted the group to decide how it would like this to work. He suggested one option is that during Phase I address point data management, the aggregator would reject an entire dataset if invalid records were identified. This is the simplest procedure at this

time since the initial practice will be to always replace all data from an addressing authority with new data from that addressing authority as update are delivered.

Action: The workgroup agreed that a dataset should be rejected due to a duplicate unique ID or invalid addressing authority. However, all other data validity tests (e.g. duplicate full address) should only result in flagging and/or notifying the data provider.

## **16. Action Items**

- Kotz will update the following for approval at the next meeting
  - Data specifications
  - Metadata