



Geospatial Advisory Council – Standards Committee Meeting

Nokomis Meeting Room, Centennial Office Building

658 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

October 25, 2017, 1:00 – 3:30 pm

Standards Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes prepared and submitted by Andra Bontrager, vice chair and Geoff Maas, chair
(Minutes approved on November 30, 2017)

1) Call to Order, Welcome and Roll Call

Chair Maas called meeting to order at 1:05 pm, welcomed the attendees both in person and participating via conference call and thanked everyone for their continued focus and energy on preparing, reviewing, and working on the standards in progress.

In attendance:

Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

Adam Iten, ECN/MNIT Services

Mike Koutnik, ESRI

Chad Riley, Carver County

Heather Albrecht, City of Maple Grove

Dan Ross, MnGeo

Geoff Maas, MetroGIS, chair

Dave Fawcett, MPCA

Nancy Rader, MnGeo

Jessica Fendos, Ramsey County

Vic Barnett, MESB

Jim Krumrie, MnGeo

Dave Sajevic, MNIT Services

Andra Bontrager, MCEA, vice chair

Attending via conference call:

Todd Lusk, Dakota County

George Meyer, Otter Tail County

Donna Martin, Pope County

Mark Volz, Lyon County

Randy Knippel, Dakota County

David Kramar, Minnesota State University-Moorhead

Philipp Nagel, City of Waseca

Michelle Trager, Rice County

2) Approval of Meeting Agenda

Motion to approve: Kotz, Second, Barnett, no discussion, unanimous approval

3) Approval of Meeting Minutes from June 21, 2017 meeting

Motion to approve: Kotz, Second, Krumrie, no discussion, unanimous approval

4) Brief Review of Address Point Standard Development and Review

Maas provided a brief review of the development of the Address Point Standard and its recent period of public review. The current candidate for a statewide address point standard represents a merging of the Metro Address Point Standards (begun in 2004, adopted in 2010, modified in 2015 and 2016) and the NextGen9-1-1 Address Point Standard (begun in 2015)

This merged standard was put out to the stakeholder community for a 60-day review period (7/24/17 through 9/22/17) with numerous comments received. Maas, on behalf of the Standards Committee, collected, organized and published these comments, and indicated these would be used as the basis for review and modification before a vote on approving the standard was taken.

5) Review & Discussion of Comments Received on the Statewide Address Point Standard

The group commenced to briefly visit, review, deliberate and decide upon the disposition, content and details of the attributes in the proposed standard that received public comments.

Approved revisions included the following:

Element 2.2 – Address Number would be expanded to a long integer with a width of 10 to accommodate potential long number addresses.

Elements 2.4 (Street Pre Modifier) and 2.11 (Street Post Modifier) were made the same width (15 characters) for uniformity.

Mixed Case instead of ALLCAPS was determined to be preferable for data in the Address Point Standard since it is easier to transfer mixed case to ALL CAPS than the reverse, since mixed case is an FGDC requirement, and since mixed case is more suitable for cartographic representation. The decision to use mixed case text applies to many of the attributes in the standard. Additionally, terms are to be spelled out to avoid ambiguity; abbreviations have the potential to be interpreted in numerous ways and potentially incorrectly (*e.g. N W Smith Tr., could represent North William Smith Trail, Nathan Walton Smith Trace, etc.*).

Element 2.5 – Street Pre Directional: The addressing authority determines if a directional attribute is *part of the name* or is in fact *functioning as a directional*, e. g. North Shore Drive vs. West North Shore Drive; if part of the name, ‘North’ is not a directional.

Element 2.6 – Street Name Pre-Type attribute expanded to 35 characters in length. The Committee is encouraging this category to build organically through usage before it publishes a domain as part of the standard; the Metro Region Centerlines Collaborative road data standard did not assign domain values to this to facilitate flexibility at the county level.

Element 2.10 – Directionals are spelled out to maintain consistency with FGDC and MRCC standards.

Elements 2.12-2.15 Subaddress Type and Code: Maintained as two Types and two Code pairs, enabling the ability to contain the NENA-designated attributes as well as freedom to use other attributes as relevant and applicable.

Element 2.16 – ZIP Code is to be categorized as Mandatory. If some data contributors do not have a zip code to apply, they can note that and their data will be compliant for inclusion.

Element 3.1 – MUNI_NAME is to be replaced by CTU_NAME (CTU = City-Township-Unorganized).

Element 3.2 – MUNI_CODE is to be replaced by CTU_ID_TEXT and is to have a width of 8. This maintains consistency with other standards already adopted and new ones in development; CTU will replace other CITY and MUNI indicators across all other standards for uniformity.

Element 3.3 – Postal Community: The Address Point Standard can accept all USPS names, with the locally preferred provided name given preference. Acceptable postal community names are available from the [USPS website](#).

Element 3.4 – County code will include the state FIPS/ANSI prefix (27) before the county code (001, 003, etc.).

Element 3.5 – Use the full list of county names (a domain is provided in the Excel document of the standard).

Element 3.6 – State Code will *exclude* Manitoba (MB) and Ontario (ON). Minnesota will not carry any Canadian postal codes (e.g. P7A 1A1) so there is no need to carry provincial abbreviations or to modify the ZIP attribute to 7 characters (from its current 5 characters). As the Address Point Standard only relates to physical addresses (and not mailing location), all accommodation for Canadian data was removed. Mailing address data is best managed in the parcel data.

In the review after receiving stakeholder comments, it was decided to re-order Elements 4 and 5. GeoLocation Elements are now 5.x and Area Elements are now 4.x.

Element 4.2 – Landmarks: One comment received was to add a second landmark column; it was decided to keep the standard uncluttered and to align with the practice of FGDC, to maintain all landmark data in one (Landmark) attribute.

Element 4.3 – Residence: This attribute identifies if an address point is a residence or not; it was requested to add other characteristics, namely Single or Multiple (dwelling units). City data production and County data aggregation practices differ (one point with many units vs. maintaining one point with numerous addresses, etc.) This attribute is much needed by demographers for Census usage; however, they might have better luck getting consistent information of this kind from the parcel data.

After a lengthy discussion of the options to include or exclude additional values, the Committee decision was not to include Single and Multiple, just to retain Yes, No, Unknown as the domain of acceptable values for the attribute and to refer users to the parcel data for extracting Single and Multiple attributes.

Element 4.6: After review and discussion of this attribute, the ‘method’ of placement was deemed less important than the ‘location’ of the placement. The attribute was renamed PLACE_LOC, and will contain non-numerical (string) codes, with a width of 2, for the placement location variables. The Committee agreed that additional values may be needed in the future, and that domain values could be added without a large formal process by being advanced to the Committee for suitability review.

No public comments were received on the Element 5.1 – 5.3 GeoLocation attributes (longitude, latitude and USNG code).

Element 6 – The 911 attributes: Originally, three elements were advanced for consideration, but after the review period comments were received, a total of five attributes specifically for 911 use are now part of the Address Point Standard.

Element 6.1 – Point of Contact: After discussion of this being the county (or tribal jurisdiction) and not a specific office or person, it was decided to leave this with potential for revision in the future.

Element 6.2 – Emergency Service Number: Leading zero inclusion was discussed as a concern as well as the fact that ESN areas change with some frequency in rural areas of Minnesota (in the Metro region these are largely fixed and managed by the MESB) and that duplicate values for the Metro ESNs and Greater Minnesota ESNs are a possibility. It was decided that leading zeros would be left off for the time being and that this attribute could be revised as more Greater Minnesota ESN values are developed, assigned and put into use.

Element 6.3 – PSAP Code: This was added as requested by stakeholder input to accommodate NextGen9-1-1 needs and usage.

Element 6.4 – MSAG Community: At present, there is not a standardized domain for these values available, so the names currently in use by local jurisdictions (community names and other locally applied names) are the best option for populating this; generally a city, town or county-assigned name is in use.

Element 6.5 – VERROR911: This newly-added attribute is intended to accommodate the requested ‘EXCEPTION’ attribute, as a means of flagging known errors that are yet to be fixed; this attribute allows a loop to avoid triggering a known exception when running a validation routine. This field has a ‘partner’ field of Element 7.8 COMMENTS where additional notes and guidance can be entered to provide context. The Committee agreed to maintain this attribute and let its use shape any need for its future modification.

Element 7.1 – Life Cycle will just contain the values ‘Active, Proposed and Retired’. A proposal to match these categories to those in the road centerline was advanced and discussed but ultimately deemed that additional values weren’t applicable to address points and were surplus to requirements.

Elements 7.2 and 7.3 – Effective Date and Expiration Date received comments as to if these were actually in use or being tracked by anyone using address point data. If the date is unknown, then a default date is not required or needed; however, an expiration of a date is recommended for use and retention by NENA. Additional discussion revealed that an address is not necessarily connected to a physical structure, for example, a business may potentially retain the use of an address that no longer is connected to a physical building. The Committee decided that ‘retired’ was more suitable for the ‘expired date’ category and changed Element 7.3 to Retired Date (RET_DATE).

Element 7.4 – Source of Data: This is retained as it aligns with the FGDC standard, generally the aggregating County or potentially Tribal Nation will be used for Source.

Element 7.5 – Address Authority was questioned as not being needed for 911 uses and potentially redundant in relation to other attributes already available (e.g. how does it differ from Source?). The address authority is generally the city/municipal unit and the county assigning addresses in rural areas. The Committee additionally agreed to maintain this attribute as mandatory.

Element 7.6 – Editing Organization is distinct in that some cities have given their editing authority to the county in which they reside (e.g. Dakota County Joint Powers Agreement with its constituent cities facilitates this arrangement), while some cities perform the editing themselves. There was some discussion about batch processing of address points by the county GIS staff and if that constitutes the

role as editor or not and if this attribute was intended to determine the person or agency responsible for assigning the address point. The attribute was maintained as Optional with a field width of 40.

During the public review period, other recommended and suggested attributes were advanced; these carry the 'Z.x' numbering system for reference.

Proposed Element Z.1 – Concatenated Address field: This was not included because there are too many possible needs and potential needed configurations for concatenation, and blending the address number (integer) with the other text fields might prove problematic.

Proposed Element Z.2 – Secondary Landmark field: All landmark information is to be entered into Element 4.2 designated for landmark data.

Proposed Element Z.3 – Legacy Street Name field: Determined that local governments could maintain this internally as needed and this was not needed in an address point transfer standard.

Proposed Element Z.4 – Exception field: This was accommodated by the addition of Element 6.5 VERROR_911 for storing a flag for known errors yet to be resolved.

Proposed Element Z.5 – Place Type field: Element 4.2 Landmark or 7.8 Comments can be used for additional type data needed for a given address point.

Proposed Element Z.6 – Country field: Not to be included, the Address Point Standard will be restricted to data within the United States.

Proposed Element Z.7 – PSAP field: A PSAP field was added as new Element 6.3

Proposed Element Z.8 – Number of Units field: This would not be included in the Address Point Standard; this information was deemed best managed and available from parcel data.

Proposed Element Z.9 – URI field: A Universal Resource Indicator was determined to be best managed locally and not needed in the Address Point Standard.

Proposed Element Z.10 – Address Type field: This is accommodated in the new Element 4.8, Unique Without Subaddresses.

Proposed Element Z.11 – CAD Address field: These would be handled internally by cities and counties as needed; there are many different CAD technologies in use around the state, each with its own needs, and unique addresses for feeding to CAD systems is handled at the local level. Use other elements in standard to management these 'active' status descriptors.

Domains in the Address Point Standard: Are they mandatory or not? Domains as presented in the standard could potentially be deemed mandatory (required to be followed), mandatory + extensible (more values can be added as local needs indicate) or completely optional and used only as guidelines. The Committee advanced an approach that the domains should be mandatory, with a good faith effort made on the part of the data producers and aggregators to fill in the data, but also with leeway and

encouragement to advance to the Standards Committee any additional values to be added to the domains as used and relevant.

With agreement on the modifications and disposition of the Address Point Standard the Committee is now to vote upon its approval or other recommended action.

6) Actions by Standards Committee on the advance and approval of the proposed Address Point Standard.

Chair Maas asked the group if there was a motion for the approval of the revisions discussed for the Address Point Standard. Motion to accept the revisions as advanced and discussed: Motion: Barnett, Second: Krumrie, no discussion, unanimous approval.

Based upon the approval of the revisions, the need for another round of public review was brought up.

A motion for no further public review of the revisions was advanced by Barnett, Second: Kotz, no discussion, unanimous approval.

Without an additional public review period, a motion for Committee approval of the Standard was requested.

A motion for approval of the Address Point Standard, as revised on 10.25.2017 was advanced by Barnett, Second: Krumrie

Discussion: Kotz recommended that the revised documents be published to the Standards Committee members for a final review and discussion for a period of one (1) week (October 30, 2017 – November 3, 2017); additional comments would be collected and circulated to the Committee members.

Maas asked the group if there was a motion for approval of an electronic (email) vote on final approval following the week of having the revised Address Point Standard circulated among the group. Motion: Fendos, Second: Koutnik, no discussion, unanimous approval.

Maas and Kotz agreed to assemble revisions as per the meeting discussion and circulate these updated materials on Monday, October 30, 2017 via email to begin the week of the discussion period and to follow up with Committee members via email for a vote concerning approval once the discussion has taken place.

Maas and Kotz circulated the revised Address Point Standard material on October 30, 2017. The Committee was asked to review and discuss the revisions via email. Please see page 8 of this document for a complete transcript of this discussion. After the close of the discussion, Maas circulated a Survey Monkey vote survey to the group, resulting in 14 in favor of approving the standard, 0 against, with 7 abstentions.

The motion to approve the Address Point Standards by the Standards Committee passed.

The Address Point Standard will now be advanced by the Standards Committee to the Geospatial Advisory Council for consideration at its December 6, 2017 regular meeting.

7) Upcoming Standards Development and Activity

Chair Maas briefly updated the group on other upcoming standards that are on their way to the Committee, these being the Parcel Data Transfer Standard (which the Parcel and Land Records Committee has put on hold until the Address Point Standard has been completed and adopted), a potential centerline standard (this being the MRCC Standard which has been recently revised to better satisfy NextGen9-1-1 uses and needs) and the Hydrologic DEM Modification (hDEM) Standard in development by the GAC's 3D Geomatics Committee.

8) Review and Revision of Adopted Standards

Chair Maas indicated that once a standard is adopted, there may be need to review and potentially revise it periodically. The Standards Committee will be taking on the task of developing guidelines for periodic review and creating a clear process for the revision of adopted standards that responds to the needs of the data producer and user community. The FGDC performs standards review on a 5-year schedule, and this was deemed appropriate for work on standards in Minnesota as well. A 5-year cycle would be a mandatory minimum for standards review, with input on needed changes being reviewed by the Standards Committee as needed. More complicated standards may require more frequent review and revisions, this is yet to be seen.

9) Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Standards Committee will be on **Thursday, November 30, 2017**, 12:30 pm – 4:30 pm, Main Board Room, 705 Courthouse Square, Stearns County Administration Bldg., St. Cloud, Minnesota; Chad Martini at Stearns County is extending their hospitality to host our next meeting, and we are very grateful to be able to accommodate our partners in Greater Minnesota with the meeting in this location. The central topic of this meeting will be the advance of the Parcel Data Transfer Standard.

10) Adjournment

Maas once again expressed his gratitude to the members for their time, focus, attention and commitment to developing these standards and asked if there was a motion to adjourn the Standards Committee meeting. Motion: Barnett, second: Iten, no discussion, unanimous approval – meeting was adjourned at 3:29 pm.

The following email exchange / discussion took place via email regarding the recommendation from Mark Kotz to circulate the revised Address Point Standard for discussion among the Committee.

GEOFF MAAS: Monday, October 30, 2017 9:50 AM

Greetings Standard Committee Members and colleagues,

Please find attached the following:

>> **Minutes** from our Committee meeting last week (10/25/17) [Vice Chair Andra Bontrager and I have summarized the key points and decisions of our discussion]

>> The **Address Point Standard** and **accompanying spreadsheet**, as updated and revised from the recommendations at our meeting;

As per our action at the meeting, we are now in the **discussion period following motion and second** to adopt the Address Points Standard as revised on 10/25/17; Please feel free to begin an email chain of any additional discussion items you feel are needed or relevant based on the agreed upon revisions.

We will keep this discussion going through end-of-day Wednesday (4:30 pm, November 1) and at which time I will send out a communication for a final vote.

I would also like to specifically acknowledge the work performed by Adam Iten, Mark Kotz, Vic Barnett, Marcia Broman and Jim Krumrie; their focus and attention to detail in the late stages of its development has made this Address Point Standard a tremendously solid and valuable resource for our profession in the state – thanks to them and to you all for your time and your thoughtful and important contributions.

Developing standards is **hard**, please know your contributions and expertise make it much easier!

Feel free to contact me with any comments or questions; I look forward to wrapping this up and delivering it to the GAC for their consideration on December 6th!

MARK KOTZ: Monday, October 30, 2017 10:28 AM

FYI, changes made since the Standards Committee meeting are highlighted in yellow in the Word doc. They are not highlighted in the spreadsheet.

VIC BARNETT: Monday, October 30, 2017 1:54 PM

This looks good to me, with a couple of comments.

- 1 In the Introduction, 2nd paragraph: *“County governments assign addresses in townships...”*. I am not sure about other counties, but in Ramsey County, Townships assign their own addresses. White Bear Township has a Building Official and Address Authority. Change last sentence to *“Cities, Townships, and Counties...”* Also, I suggest including a statement that address authority can be seated to other jurisdictional authorities in their administrative areas such as Military Bases, The University of MN, MSP Airport, State Fairgrounds, are all their own Addressing Authorities.

-
- 2 I do not think we should include Tower as a Subaddress Type. The type precedes the ID: It's not "Tower Social Sciences" Also if we include Tower then why not include "Hall", such as "Blegen Hall", and if we included Hall then we end up including Library," Walter Library".

That's all I have on this version. N Number 1, needs correction in some way. Number 2 is more of a personal world view.

PHILIPP NAGEL: Monday, October 30, 2017 3:09 PM

Thanks for sending these docs! My only question as I read through is this: Regarding adding items to the domains, could an issue arise where points need to be transferred in the standard, but the domain has not been updated yet to include a local value that was not included originally? We only state this will happen periodically. Maybe this could be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

MARK KOTZ: Monday, October 30, 2017 3:41 PM

That's a good point Philipp. I'm sure that scenario to happen. This is really new territory for the GAC and the Standards Committee. I'm thinking the local address authority would include the new domain value in their data and also submit the change to the Standards Committee. Hopefully it would be approved. If it was rejected, then they would have to remove those values from their data to be in compliance. I think we will just have to work through the process and see how it shakes out.

MARK KOTZ: Monday, October 30, 2017 3:55 PM

Thanks Vic, here is a modification of the intro paragraph.

1 - In Minnesota, addresses originate primarily from the work of city and county governments. City councils have legal authority to assign addresses (Minnesota Statutes §412.221, Subd. 18) and in practice, that action is carried out on behalf of a city council by different city departments such as public works or planning or zoning. County governments assign addresses in most townships and unorganized areas of the state. Some townships are also official address authorities, and in some cases, other entities may be seated the authority to create addresses. E.g. military bases, University of MN, MSP Airport.

2 - Actually, in common vernacular the sub-address type may go before or after the sub-address ID. My examples try to show the common vernacular. For 'tower' it could go either way: North Tower, South Tower, etc. or Tower B, Tower 2. At the University of Minnesota, I was often in the Social Studies Tower. And yes, there are probably a bunch of sub-address types we are missing. Maybe that's why the FGDC didn't have a domain; 'Hall' is a good example.

JESSICA FENDOS: Tuesday, October 31, 2017, 9:27 PM

I have two suggestions. Our meeting minutes states that *Elements 2.4 (Street Name Pre Modifier) and 2.11 (Street Name Post Modifier) were made the same width (15 characters) for uniformity.* However, in the Address Point Data Schema spreadsheet and Data Standard Document, the field width for Street Name Post Modifier says 12. In regards to Element 7.5 in the minutes -- *Address Authority was questioned as not being needed for 911 uses and potentially redundant in relation to other attributes already available (e.g. how does it differ from Source?). The address authority is generally the city/municipal unit and the county assigning addresses in rural areas.* Could we consider adding "The Committee agreed to maintain this attribute as mandatory" just to be clear? Thanks for your attention.

MARK KOTZ: Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 8:53 AM

Thanks Jessica. I have updated the Street Name Post Modifier element to width 15. I like your suggestion for clarity in the meeting notes.