Attendees:
Tanya Mayer, Metropolitan Council
Joe Sapletal, Dakota County
Pete Henschel, Carver County
Gordy Chinander, Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Adam Iten, MN.IT Services
John Hoshal, MnGeo
Marcia Broman, Consultant to Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council (work group chair)
Dave Brandt, Washington County
Joel Koepp, City of Roseville
Matt Mclees, Scott County
Matt Koukol, Ramsey County
Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District

Staff:
Geoff Maas, MetroGIS Coordinator

Agenda Item 1) Welcome & Introductions
Chair Kotz welcomed the members, and each participant introduced themselves.

Agenda Item 2) Approval of Agenda
Meeting agenda unanimously approved by the group;

Agenda Item 3) A Review of our Vision – Where are we now?
Chair Kotz gave a short presentation on the original vision of what was to be achieved by the Address Points Workgroup, the groups initial agreed upon definition of address points, revisited the initial vision of what was desired for the data and a brief overview of the current status of the address point dataset.

- Point location of every official address
- Data would come from the authoritative source
- Made up to date daily (eventually)
- Be available region-wide in a standardized format
- Freely available
- Sustainable solution (continual operation and availability)
Kotz reiterated the original roles of the various participants (city, county, regional and state)

**Cities** are generally in the role of the Official Address Authority
Having one “official” source for an address ensures it is authoritative, accurate and updates will be made in a timely manner;

**County** governments serve as partners with the cities, in some circumstances acting as Address Authority, but also to aggregate points from their cities and provide technical support/coordination as needed.

**Regional and State** partners serve in the role of coordination, aggregation and distribution with the Metropolitan Council funding the development and maintenance of the Address Point Editor Tool Application.

**Current Status:** At present, three (3) of the Metro Counties have assembled and published their address point data; these are Carver, Dakota and Ramsey counties. Region-side there are 70 cities with data, 31 organizations have contributed edits. Version 2.0 of the Address Point Editing Tool is in use in three contributing counties, with Version 3.0 of the tool currently being tested; to be available in mid-March. Additionally, the Metropolitan Council has been working with the DNR on improving the synchronization tool development, have been exploring the GDRS resources for its potential to be used to aggregate address point data.

**Agenda Item 4) Maximizing Appropriate Use of the Data – Communicating Completeness**

Jon Hoekenga, GIS Systems Administrator with the Metropolitan Council led the group through a brief presentation on measures of completeness exhibited by the address point data currently coming in from the city authorities and county aggregators.

He listed there was a strong need for being able to capture the number of individual units on each parcel, and conceded that this is challenging but remains a critical goal for the project.

As the currently available data from Carver, Dakota and Ramsey aggregation efforts reflects a mix of parcel centroids, quasi-complete and complete (authoritative) address points, there is the possibility to add a domain to the data to communicate how complete a given address point is.

Hoekenga presented an option of having a simple Yes/No option available, with:

Yes meaning: “Address point represents a single address”
No meaning “Address point may represent multiple addresses within a parcel”

These would help the data user make an informed decision about their use of the data points.

Hoekenga encouraged the group to comment on this proposed domain and its application and make suggestions.

N. Read: If we are going to carry a yes/no, wouldn’t ‘unknown’ be the third option?
M. Kotz: The unknown category would likely act as a default; the main goal of this would be to letting the user know if the address point is an authoritative point and meets the full criteria and what that means.

M. Koukol: This would be better way to do it, most users are simply not going to go to the metadata and look up the condition of the point on a city by city basis.

J. Koepp: So this is essentially a kind of ‘health’ indicator of the point; we could have some kind of color code to represent the condition of the point, perhaps.

M. Kotz: We could potentially say something for the entire city, such as ‘this city’s data is in category ‘x’ with over 90% of its points authoritative, this city is in the next category with 80-90, and so on.

M. Koukol: Best we can do know at present is to indicate that ‘yes, this city is actively adding good points to the system’.

M. Kotz: We can get to a point to where, they’ve hit a certain threshold of achievement. With the domains we give the address authority, clear descriptions and let them pick the ones that represents the work they do.

N. Read: Are there other sources we can compare them to?

P. Henschel: We can, and do, compare them against the data we acquire from utilities.

A. Iten: For 911, we still can grab land line 911 data, while that is in decline we still could compare it against that.

M. Koukol: We geocode MSAG (Master Street Address Guide) addresses where there is supposed to be an address present and they will effectively geocode, but they might not have all the attributes.

**Action Item:**
M. Kotz. We appear to have the need to create some clear categories for cities to self-report on the condition of their data.

J. Koepp: If possible, the number of choices (for these categories) needs to be small, but clear and meaningful.

N. Read: Would this [category] be an attribute on individual records?

M. Kotz: There is the potential that every point is a unique address and would carry the category designation.

M. Koukol: We would likely not be able to use the existing positional accuracy domain already available in the standard.
Agenda Item 5) Increasing Ease of Use – Opportunities for Domains
J. Hoekenga: We’d like to get some additional feedback on the potential addition of new domains to make the data more usable.

Meeting the National address standard which specifies mixed case usage, at present, inputs to the existing data are not consistent or standardized, this makes analysis tasks difficult. Expanding the use of domains in the data would help streamline this and make the data more useful to the end user.

For example, in our current [MetroGIS] standard, we have a simple Yes/No for the ‘Mail able’ category, but we receive a range of inputs such as No, NO, Unknown, UNKNOWN, y, Y, Yes, YES, YEST, and so on. This range of variations makes it difficult to so efficient analysis of the data.

We should explore creating domains to make data entry easy, comply with our standard. Some of these criteria reference the national standard and some don’t, there are around 15 fields that would benefit from us defining and using a domain.

M Kotz: Regarding domains, some domains are implied, but not specifically developed in our standard or the national standard. Up to now, we have not had any formal validation process, so updating the standard with domains would make things work better.

Action Item:
We should go through the list of attributes in our existing standard and compile a list of the fields with would benefit from an established domain and values to populate that domain. Also we should be working through the issues/identifying a best practice for all caps vs. mixed case (USPS Standard and federal standard do not clearly align on this issue).

M. Koukol: With the Metro Regional Centerline Collaborative street centerline project, we have a domain set for street types and it is certainly possible to automate into all caps if data is put in originally in mixed case.

N. Read: Is there an acceptable list of municipal names that is being used?

M. Kotz: We are presently using the ID number and lookup table for city name.

D. Brandt: One of our challenges is that our tax system software is automatically populating the city names, we [in GIS] can’t control that input.

N. Read: At present the township names are posing a real challenge to work with.

M. Kotz: The unique ID number solution to represent the city or township name could be generated at the regional aggregator level (counties or cities may want an official way to enter the information)

<<< brief group discussion of variations of city names, including official name being City of Roseville or just Roseville, spelling out “St. Louis Park” vs. “Saint Louis Park”, St. Paul vs. Saint Paul, etc. >>>

J. Hoshal: the Secretary of State’s office should have the record of the official names of each city.
Action Item:
Develop a solution for automating the correct city/township names and incorporating approved domains for street types (suffixes), including a look at how applicable federal standards handle street types.

Agenda Item 6) Updates to Data Specifications
M. Kotz: We have not visited the data specifications in some time and I would like to remove wording that doesn’t fit with current progress and what we are working on including wording about the draft national standard. I proposed removing everything that has been struck-through in red:

MetroGIS Address Points Database Specifications
Latest version approved by MetroGIS Address Workgroup: 06/10/2010 2/23/15

Address Points Database Standards
In February 2010 a new draft of the national standard was published and submitted to the Federal Geographic Data Committee as a proposed national standard: http://www.uri-a.org/about/initiatives/addressstandard. The FGDC has announced a formal public review period for this standard. The intention of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup is to review these specifications for possible modifications when and if a final national address data standard is approved.

See MetroGIS comments on the draft national standard http://www.mageo.state.ma.us/committee/standards/address/address-standard.html

The database format for the MetroGIS Address Points Dataset is derived primarily from the Content portion of the United States Thoroughfare, Landmark, and Postal Address Data Standard. Some additional data elements have been added to satisfy data needs at the local level. November 2005 published draft national standard and the February 2010 published draft national standard, as well as the combined thought and experience of the MetroGIS Address Workgroup. In 2006 the Workgroup conducted a data pilot project to test a preliminary set of data specifications with real data in cities and counties. The results of that pilot suggested some modest changes to the data specifications, namely with optional items, and also provided some comments on suggested changes and clarifications to the draft national standard. The specifications were modified again after the publishing of the 2010 draft national standard.

At this time, the MetroGIS specifications focus on the ability to encode address point data into a fairly simple, flat database file format (e.g. shapefile). An associated XML schema is under development. See Appendix B for a draft XML formatting template.

G. Chinander: Regarding the use of XML, NENA is pushing using XML for NextGen911.

M. Kotz: We can leave the XML as an appendix until that is formally decided by NENA; many users at present aren’t using it in the way we anticipated it would be used.
M. Kotz: Also, I am proposing we clean up the language about latitude/longitude and datum and I am proposing we can remove the USNG coordinate statement as well as it is, at present, not one of our considerations.

G. Chinander: Regarding coordinate system, NENA recommends the use of WGS84 (World Geodetic System 1984)

<< Group assent that WGS84 is a suitable solution>>

J. Sapletal: I wouldn’t dismiss this; we’re [Dakota County GIS] working pretty well with numerous partners with the USNG material.

M. Kotz: I don’t disagree; we can revisit it and add in USNG coordinates in a later version of the specifications.

G. Chinander: There are a number of extra fields form NENA data model as well, these include:

- Country
- Emergency Service Number
- MSAG Community Name
- Postal Community Name
- Also, our field widths will need to meet those in NENA (when it is finalized)

D. Brandt: I don’t want to overwhelm our municipalities with too many attributes.

M. Koukol: If these [NENA features] are available in code form, we should look to keep in code form in our address data.

N. Read: How do the postal community attributes work? I would assume that the US Postal Service would have the data? And are they using the USPS place name or a [numerical] code?

M. Kotz: All these are good comments, once NENA standard is finalized and available we can revisit ours to align it.

**Action Items:**

- Update Existing Address Standard to include WGS84.
- Determine if USPS maintains a type of numerical code for representing postal communities.
Agenda Item 7) Help with Meeting the Specifications – Do We Want a Validation Tool?

J. Hoekenga: At present, with the data coming in, we [Metropolitan Council] have been gathering the data and checking it manually. However, we’d like to develop a Python script to compare against established domains. We have a validation tool like this that we are using for parcels now and we’re interested in something like it for address points.

M. Kotz: It might be more efficient, we could avoid numerous rechecking if cities or county-aggregators had something like this to run.

J. Hoekenga: Our question is to the Counties, if we created something like this, would you be willing to make use of it?

J. Sapletal: I’d recommend you check with Todd Lusk in Dakota County, he might be already doing this and may have already created something

Action Item:
J. Hoekenga to contact T. Lusk (Dakota Co.) and determine if they have a validation tool in production or under development that could be proto-typed or expanded.

Agenda Item 8) Address Point Aggregation Update

J. Hoekenga: We had a separate meeting focused specifically on the aggregation of the points in 2014, working to agree to a way to bring everything together, looking at the readiness and development of the GDRS and the ability to aggregate up to the Commons eventually. We know the tools are being developed at the state, and if these are the way we want to go (using state tools and state conversion) go beyond the metro region, cooperative aggregation strategy from metro usable to the state as well.

Our next step will be to re-convene the aggregation work group and make some determination of the best way to move forward.

Action Item:
When needed, re-convene aggregation group to decide on a way forward, if a mid-term or intermediate step is needed before full commitment to the GDRS is needed.

A. Iten: If this is working well for metro so far, it would probably work well for Greater Minnesota as well. We will need to perform some kind of high-level quality assurance testing when the [locally-created address point] data comes in, and then another quality-assurance check on it so it is validated before it reaches the 911 systems that will use it.

M. Kotz: Is there at present any automating of data occurring at MnGeo?

J. Hoshal: Not that I’m aware of, none at present; this may come to the fore with the road centerline work eventually.

J. Sapletal: One last point with the address data: Open Addresses (http://openaddresses.io/) is pulling the data from our sites and aggregating it nationally and internationally;
Agenda Item 9) Web Editing Tool Version 3.0 Update and Demo
T. Mayer: The Metropolitan Council has been managing the contract for the third version of the Address Editor tool; we had collected the ‘wish list’ of desired attributes from those using Version 2.0. The project team included the following participants:

Dakota County:
- Joe Sapletal
- Todd Lusk

North Point Geographic Solutions:
- Jesse Adams
- Caroline Adams
- Kris Johnson

Carver County:
- Nate Christ
- Pete Henschel

Hennepin County:
- Eric Hanson
- Doug Breeden
- Ann Houghton

MESB

MetroGIS
- Tanya Mayer

This team decided upon seven (7) functional requirements for the Version 3.0 of the tool, these included:

1. Support Address-Change report building
2. Add functionality to allow the Add New Points tool to stay active for all multiple point adds situations
3. Add functionality to allow for the ability to page through item attributes of multiple selected points
4. Modify user interface with a larger comments field and make scrollable or pop-out window
5. Support checks for duplicate addresses
6. Add a calculate ‘hypothetical address’ tool
7. Add functionality to allow for proposed address point selection, map display and report building

Joe Sapletal (Dakota County) gave a PowerPoint presentation detailing the look, feel and function of each of the newly added seven (7) requirements added to Version 3.0 of the Editor Tool. This presentation is available as an appendix to these notes.

T. Mayer: Version 3.0 still testing at the moment. Staff at both Hennepin County and Carver County Hen and Carver have tested it, we are working to resolve all final issues and the Metropolitan Council will be
closing out the contract with North Point Geographics in mid-March (2015), we anticipate being able to make the Version 3.0 editor available then.

M. Koukol: Do they anticipate problems with ArcMap 10.3?

J. Sapletal: We have tested it already, seems to be working fine.

T. Mayer: We did encounter an issue with Internet Explorer 11, but North Point was able to resolve that pretty quickly.

J. Sapletal: Also we know a number of users will be transitioning from http to https; we haven’t encountered any issues with that change either.

A. Iten: Can the State of Minnesota get access to this tool?

T. Mayer: Yes, our contract is set up so all governments in Minnesota can have access to this tool, however, North Point Geographics retains the right to sell the tool outside if Minnesota.

J. Sapletal: We will want to start thinking how to get things to be mobile friendly as well; the City of Burnsville is out verifying addresses using mobile devices, we (Dakota County) needed to set up a separate interest for their collection.

N. Read: One of our earlier points with the MetroGIS geocoder was that we’d eventually run it on regional address points, currently it is still running on parcel [centroid] points, and it is still getting around 1,000 hits a week, I am wondering what the group’s thoughts are on that? I know the airport [Metropolitan Airports Commission] is thinking of using it, it remains a good regional resource, is anyone else running into the need for a free regional geocoder?

M. Koukol: Certainly possible to add it in as part of a higher-level compositor.

N. Read: Related to that as well, the TLG (NCompass) data has kind of fallen by the wayside of late, I know that contract is ending this year, but we need a solution like it in our geocoder.

M. Kotz: At the Council, we are using parcel points internally plus whatever we have available, we had to make one specifically for our Metro Transit trip planner application, and we tuned it specifically for transit landmarks and transit users.

J. Sapletal: At Dakota County, we run through nineteen (19) of our own data layers of Dakota layer and then against the NCompass data at the end;

J. Hoshal: At the state as well, we are using the NCompass data along with parcel points, we are using an Arc engine for that in a nine (9) tier system, with several databases in use.
Agenda Item 10) Review Action Items

Action Item:
Create some clear categories for cities to self-report on the condition of their data.

Action Item:
We should go through the list of attributes in our existing standard and compile a list of the fields with would benefit from an established domain and values to populate that domain. Also we should be working through the issues/identifying a best practice for all caps vs. mixed case (USPS Standard and federal standard do not clearly align on this issue).

Action Item:
Develop a solution for automating the correct city/township names and incorporating approved domains for street types (suffixes), including a look at how applicable federal standards handle street types.

Action Items:
- Update Existing Address Standard to include WGS84 (approved coordinate system)
- Confirm and perform suggested text edits to existing standard as advanced by M. Kotz (pp. 5-6)
- Determine if USPS maintains a type of numerical code for representing postal communities.

Action Item:
J. Hoekenga to contact T. Lusk (Dakota Co.) and determine if they have a validation tool in production or under development that could be proto-typed or expanded.

Action Item:
When needed, re-convene aggregation group to decide on a way forward, if a mid-term or intermediate aggregation step is needed before full commitment to the GDRS is needed.

Agenda Item 11) Adjournment
Chair Kotz adjourned the meeting at 2:15 pm
MetroGIS Address Editor
Version 3 What’s New?

Joe Sapletal, GISP – Dakota County
Tanya Mayer – Metropolitan Council
MetroGIS Address Workgroup - February 2015
Project Team:

**North Point Geographic Solutions:**
- Jesse Adams
- Caroline Adams
- Kris Johnson

**Carver County:**
- Nate Christ
- Pete Henschel

**Dakota County**
- Joe Sapletal
- Todd Lusk

**Hennepin County:**
- Eric Hanson
- Doug Breeden
- Ann Houghton

**MESB**

**MetroGIS**
- Tanya Mayer
7 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Support Address-Change report building
2. Add functionality to allow the Add New Points tool to stay active for all multiple point add situations
3. Add functionality to allow for the ability to page through item attributes of multiple selected points
4. Modify user interface with a larger comments field and make scrollable or pop-out window
5. Support checks for duplicate addresses
6. Add a calculate ‘hypothetical address’ tool
7. Add functionality to allow for proposed address point selection, map display and report building
1. SUPPORT ADDRESS-CHANGE REPORT BUILDING

Solution:
Add a report generator feature in the application that would allow the addressing authority the ability to run a report after the user finished entering address information or a selected set of features. The report output would include selected addresses and attributes, as well as a map of the specified area.

1. Report template that can be printed in multiple formats.
2. Configurable list of attributes for the report.
3. Dynamic labels selected in the application would be printed in the map on the report.
4. Ability to use their own logo to include in the pdf report.
5. Ability to store reports in the Address Editor Application via a web link.
6. Ability to print one or multiple address points on a report.
Reporting

City of Roseville Address Point Editor Application

Generate a report
- Report on Selected Features
- Report by Date

6 features selected.
Report Format:
- PDF
- CSV

Comments:

Go
Reporting by Date Range
Reporting by Date Range
Reporting by Date Range
# Report Updates

## METROGIS - Proposed Address Report

**ADDRESSING DIVISION**

5200 85TH AVENUE NORTH  
MN 55443

PHONE (763) 424 - 8000  
FAX (763) 493 - 8391

**REPORT DATE:** 01/26/2015

**COMMENTS:**

**DATE RANGE:** 1/1/2015 - 1/26/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD ADDRESS</th>
<th>NEW ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAST UPDATED</th>
<th>ADDRESS ID</th>
<th>ADDRESS STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>111 D STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>112 D STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; TODD STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>113 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; TODD STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>114 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; TODD STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>115 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; TODD STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>116 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; TODD STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>117 B STREET, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>01/15/2015</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test point from 1/15/15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Report Deletes

### METROGIS - Proposed Address Report

**ADDRESSING DIVISION**  
5200 85TH AVENUE NORTH        MN  55443  
PHONE (763) 424 - 8000  
FAX (763) 493 - 8391  

**REPORT DATE:** 01/26/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD ADDRESS</th>
<th>NEW ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAST UPDATED</th>
<th>ADDRESS ID</th>
<th>ADDRESS STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777 County Road B2, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable. Address deleted.</td>
<td>01/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address deleted. Information is not retrievable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT MAP

METROGIS - Proposed Address Report

ADDRESSING DIVISION
5200 85TH AVENUE NORTH
PHONE (763) 424 - 8000
FAX (763) 493 - 8391

REPORT DATE: 01/26/2015
2. ADD FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW THE ADD NEW POINTS TOOL TO STAY ACTIVE FOR ALL MULTIPLE POINT ADD SITUATIONS

Solution:
Modify existing Add Point Tool to stay active until it’s turned off to support this functionality.
3. ADD FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW FOR THE ABILITY TO PAGE THROUGH ITEM ATTRIBUTES OF MULTIPLE SELECTED POINTS

Solution:

The Consultant will create a tool to the specifications of MetroGIS, which allows for selecting multiple points and showing their attributes individually for editing.
Attributes of Multiple Points
4. MODIFY USER INTERFACE WITH A LARGER COMMENTS FIELD AND MAKE SCROLLABLE OR A POP-OUT WINDOW

Solution:
Modify the application user interface for ease of viewing the entire comments field content. Possibly extend functionality to other fields.

1. Scrolling combo box when a user clicks in the field.
2. Config. file switch/option on any field that a user would wish to have a larger box or pop-up.
Expanding Textboxes
5. SUPPORT CHECKS FOR DUPLICATE ADDRESSES

Solution:
The Consultant will coordinate with MetroGIS to develop a workflow for this functionality that will fit the needs of the application.

1. Upon save, verify recently added points against existing points and show a pop-up warning that the address is a duplicate, with the option to save, cancel or zoom
Duplicates

City of Roseville Address Point Editor Application

The Address is Duplicated. Do you want to: Save | Cancel | ZoomTo

Address Points
- Address Number: 2230
- Street Name: Midland Grove
- Source: Community Development
- Municipal Name: City of Roseville
- Updated Date: 1/26/2015
- Address Status: 1 of 36

Tools
- Delete | Save
Zoom to Duplicates
6. ADD A CALCULATE ‘HYPOTHETICAL ADDRESS’ TOOL

Business Need:
Allow the application to calculate and return the hypothetical address of a new point with a tool that can be configured for each address authority. Each organization would have the ability to input its own algorithm in the configuration file to drive the tool.

Solution:
The Consultant will set up the config. file to allow the ability for MetroGIS to calculate and return a point for a hypothetical address, based on a sample tool(s) from MetroGIS.

1. Allow the definition of a formula and grid in the back-end, for each address authority
2. Show calculated hypothetical address on map with new added point
Theoretical Address
7. ADD FUNCTIONALITY TO ALLOW FOR PROPOSED ADDRESS POINT SELECTION, MAP DISPLAY AND REPORT BUILDING

Solution:
1. All preliminary points not modified in 1 (or X) month(s) are reported when application starts with the option to print a report of those points at that time.

2. Create tool to generate a proposed address points report.
Proposed Address Report
Proposed Address Report
# Proposed Address Report

**ADDRESSING DIVISION**  
5200 85TH AVENUE NORTH  
MN 55443

PHONE (763) 424 - 8000  
FAX (763) 493 - 8391

**REPORT DATE:** 01/26/2015

**COMMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD ADDRESS</th>
<th>NEW ADDRESS</th>
<th>LAST UPDATED</th>
<th>ADDRESS ID</th>
<th>ADDRESS STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>1234 &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is an address I changed on 1/13/2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>1112 &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This address was changed from 1111 per a letter from the President of the United States of America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>1111 &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66666 &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>1115 &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is another address I changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>3333 County Rd C, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>This is a test of long comments in a report to see the wrapping on the PDF report with map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt; &lt;blank&gt;, &lt;blank&gt;, MN &lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>&lt;blank&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Address Report

METROGIS - Proposed Address Report

ADDRESSING DIVISION
5200 85TH AVENUE NORTH
PHONE (763) 424 - 8000
FAX (763) 493 - 8391

REPORT DATE: 01/26/2015
Two Other New Items
Plus...

• Documentation updates
• Code organization and Management Updates
• Application Testing and QA
• Project Management and Oversight using JIRA software and Agile process
AGILE

• Two Week Sprints
• Manage project in JIRA
  – User stories
  – Assign work
  – Bugs
  – Etc.
• User Acceptance Testing their site
• Setup and UAT our TST site
Components - Servers

- ArcGIS Server 10.2
- .NET 4.0 (Authentication & uploading functionality) – C# Server-side coding
- Python 2.7 for CAD upload, Export and reporting functions
- ReportLab Python Library for report formatting and configuration
- AsyncFileUpload Control from Ajax Control ToolKit
Components – Client Side

- Esri JavaScript API 3.12
- Dojo 1.10.2
- Kinetic JS – client-side georeferencing
- Dojo Growl Notifications
WHEN CAN WE USE IT?
MID-MARCH