

# **Address, NG911 and Transportation Committees Combined Committee Meeting 2015 NSGIC Midyear Meeting Meeting Notes**

## **Chronological (?) Notes (Dan and Andy) Formatting and additional notes (Gene)**

Meeting called to order at approximately 8:15 pm

This is an experiment to see if the three committees can meet together at the Midyear and Annual meetings. Many of the members are on more than one committee, so this may be a better way to coordinate the activities of the three committees. Monthly meetings will still be held by individual committees with reps from the other committees making reports.

The initial discussion was on the importance of roads and addresses, especially for NG911 purposes.

- Add Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) to addresses and centerlines
- Centerlines for NG911 need to be segmented at PSAP boundary. Is it possible to get that in ARNOLD?
- RI is considering creating LRS events to represent parcel frontages
- Census is rolling out Community TIGER - online and desktop tools from Esri for data edits, for state and local people to edit TIGER data.
- NENA data model includes definitions of the boundary layers that are needed for NG. Addresses and centerlines need to agree with those.
- Tim Trainor, Census, gave a brief report on the Census RFI and RFP.
- Can/should NSGIC respond to Census RFI? Yes and we did.
- Census RFI and RFP purpose is to supplement, not replace, the data they get from local-state rollout. Because there are some places where there is no good local data.
- Do we need a new strategy for a National Address Database (Russ)?
- NSGIC should empower states with poor addresses (Tim Trainor)
- Census MAF has 197 million addresses, 146 million of those are residential.
- Should we get the governor's attention – Bert believes there more we can do at the state level to push states to get their Census addresses improved (Bert)
- Education and outreach for locals ties the three committees together (Sandy)
- ARNOLD success started with NSGIC – snap points at state boundaries to make sure that road network has connectivity is VERY important to FHWA. They would prefer that the states get together to set those, otherwise FHWA may set the points.
  - How can we make ARNOLD more useful? – ARNOLD use cases to be presented at GIS-T pre-conference workshop called “ARNOLD Beyond HPMS.” Would like to have states present their stories at that if possible.
  - Address Summit will be held in April. USDOT is hosting a meeting of major federal, state, local, private and association address stakeholders. (Steve Lewis, USDOT)
- Denver area is doing centerline and address matching (Nathan)

- Edge matching algorithms developed by Census can be shared with states– we are a “data acquisition shop” – National Map uses Census data (Tim Trainor)
  - Can do it all with a single database – does NSGIC have a position on this? – add to tasks with short term goals (Bert)
  - We could have a single database and extract data to build specific address profile databases to meet the business needs of different programs and purposes
  - We should involve more associations with local members to get more locals involved? – use partner firms to tap into this – build “profiles” for different centerline users (Cy)
  - Should we document best practices? (Russ) Yes (Gene)
  - Census can share documents related to federal requirements for road data gathered previously. They also have presentations from their previous address summit in WV (Tim T)
  - We should revisit the Stakeholder Input review document from last mid-year – Addresses key take aways are good – ROI on addresses (Bill B)
  - It was brought up that Seattle had developed a rigorous ROI. Their study showed an 10 to 1 ROI. They spent \$120 million and got a return of \$1.2 billion. (Cy Smith)
  - Will’s work on addresses (Nathan)
  - Other possible ROIs include: Florida, NY, NC, MT, West Indian group
  - First GSSI has good use cases (Joe Sewash)
  - Value of ARNOLD is not well communicated – USDOT and FHWA is requesting better need talking points (Steve Lewis)
  - HPMS does not require addresses... we need to educate NHTSA on the need for addresses (Tom Roff, FHWA)
  - ARNOLD has matured. The data models and process, both conceptual and operations are more detailed. This needs to be better communicated to transportation (including state) decision makers. (Steve L)
  - What states are adding addresses as an LRS event? (Gene)
  - What states are building addresses from scratch? NSGIC could provide best practices to those states (Tim T, Gene, Bill B)
  - We should ID cor elements in the NENA standards for roads and addresses. Bert would like to identify how to extend the NENA model to accommodate other business cases.
  - We need to identify standards and best practices. (Joe Sewash)
  - NENA standard will become ANSI standards. (Kathy L and Sandy)
- 
- The common points of the stakeholder review document are: ROI, data modeling standards, and best practices (Nathan)
  - Someone pointed out that address points could be created for road intersections.
  - Lots of discussion on how to organize the three committees going forward. Suggestion for “commando groups” that are organized around a short-term task.
  - Chairs/co-chairs of all three committees initially should make recommendations on best way to organize for the future and what tasks we should focus on (Dan W)
  - Business drivers should be a main focus on organizing our efforts (Kenny).

- We should break out small work groups that could combine members from the different committees to focus on specific outcomes and purposes. (Gene, Dan, Russ)

**Burgess Input** - A question was raised about what we agreed to do from the Stakeholder Report. My recollection is that we agreed to do the following for Addresses and Transportation. There were no recommendations for NG 9-1-1.

2) An abbreviated Data Standard based on the FGDC Standard needs to be developed to show only those “Core Elements” that must be uniform in all addressing/transportation efforts. **The standard may already have a core element section. Census already has a core elements list.**

3) A Data Model and Exchange Standard must be agreed to, and heavily promoted to ensure that additional models and standards are not continually developed to meet individual needs. **NENA already has an exchange standard. CLDXF ?? Should we endorse any standard or just let the vendors take care of it?**

- We should simplify this effort by creating categories for participation like:
  - Tier 1: Core Elements
  - Tier 2: Mandatory Elements for Specific Applications
  - Tier 3: Optional Elements
- We should not complicate this job when the Core Elements are universal and relatively easy to achieve. We can focus on necessary exceptions later.

4) A simple data workflow process model must be developed that demonstrates the importance for local government address and transportation authorities to assign and locate (X & Y Coordinate) the address, and update the address repositories. The key is to have statutes and workflows that support the local maintenance of the address point database and transportation data as new addresses and road segments are created. **Russ is going to focus on this at the Address Committee meeting next week.**

Additional Notes (Russ):

Census needs us to empower states that are not in a good position to collect data.

Questions regarding committee(s) organization. How do we organize to get tasks done? Should we organize around NG911? Should we pick specific tasks and assign them to committee members? What are the goals? What is achievable? Who are the stakeholders? One committee focused on outcomes? Should focus on ROI and data models.

Business needs require different datasets. Possible to maintain linear referencing and routing in one database. Derivatives can then flow to appropriate data models. Need to figure out who is on what path with LRS and addressing.

Leverage URISA to connect with locals?

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10 pm.

Attendance List:

First	Last	Organization	Trans	Address	NG
Andy	Rowan	NJ	x	x	x
Bert	Granberg	UT	x	x	x
Bill	Burgess	NSGIC	x	x	x
Curtis	Pulford	AZ	x	x	x
Cy	Smith	OR			
Dan	Ross	MN			
Dan	Widner	VA	x	x	x
Duncan	Guthrie	1Spatial	x	x	x
Erin	Lesh	MD	x		
Gene	Trobia	AZ	x	x	x
Jason	Howard	AZ	x	x	
Jennie	Kardlewich	Census			
Joe	Sewash	NC	x	x	x
Jonathan	Souten	Michael Baker		x	x
Kaile	Bower	Census		x	
Kathy	Liljequist	GeoComm/NENA			x
Kenny	Miller	MD		x	x
Laura	Waggoner	Census			
Leland	Pierce	NM	x	x	
Lynda	Liptrap	Census			

Mark	Bradford	USDOT	x		
Mark	Holmes	MI		x	x
Mary	Braner-Cox	1Spatial	x	x	x
Miriam	Pomilio	DE	x	x	
Nathalie	Smith	Esri			
Nathan	Lowry	CO		x	x
Nathan	Watermeier	NE		x	x
Pat	Cummings	Esri		x	
Phil	Rowwall	IN		x	
Raymond	Horner	Intrado			x
Richard	Butgereit	FL			
Richard	Leadbeater	Esri	x	x	x
Russ	Provost	Michael Baker		x	x
Sandi	Stroud	Michael Baker		x	x
Sandra	Dyre	AZ		x	x
Shane	White	RI	x	x	
Steve	Lewis	USDOT	x		
Suart	Irby	Census		x	
Tim	Trainor	Census			
Tony	Spicci	MO, MAGIC		x	