

Public Review Comments and Responses for the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council Road Centerline Data Standard V1.1

The Standards Committee of the Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council (GAC) held a public review period for proposed version 1.1 of the GAC Road Centerline Data Standard from August 7 to October 12, 2020. Below is a table showing the comments received and responses approved by the Standards Committee on 11/4/2020. Responses include changes to the standard and other actions.

#	Comment	Submitter	Standards Committee Response
	Section 2. Linear Reference Elements		
1	<p>Comment: Section 2 includes linear reference elements. The elements described are insufficient to construct linear reference routes and measures. For example, a route zero point must be defined, and units of measure must be given.</p> <p>Recommendation: For a brief, clear description of the elements needed to construct a linear reference system, consult the FGDC Transportation Base Standard, Appendix B (Linear Reference Systems), available here: https://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/framework-data-standard/GI_FrameworkDataStandard_Part7_Transportation_Base.pdf</p>	Ed Wells, Retired	The linear reference elements included in the standard meet the defined needs of our stakeholder community at this time. Creating a linear reference system is not a documented need for this transfer standard. We will consider enhancing these elements in the future.
	Section 3. Geocoding Elements		
2	<p>Comment refers to: Sec 3, pp 10-12 (Street Names).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it sufficient to provide for only three street names per segment? I can easily imagine a stretch of pavement with federal, state, and county route designators, a local name, and a local honorific name. 2. If provision is made for alternate street names, why should only one street name be parsed? <p>Recommendation: Consider placing street names in their own table, one street name per record, in both parsed and complete form, separated from the segments. Any number of street names, aliases, legacy names, etc. could then be related to any given segment, and vice versa.</p>	Ed Wells, Retired	This was discussed at length in the Standards Committee which chose the current method at this time. We will consider other options in the future. A future best practices guide could give further guidance on handling multiple street names.

	Section 4. Geocoding Side Feature Elements																				
3	4.5 & 4.6 (Parity) – utilize NENA’s domain of E, O, B, Z as the codes and fully spelled out equivalents as the value so as to keep local datasets from exceeding maximum NENA field widths, increasing compatibility between the two standards	Megan Sisko, State of MN	This has previously been discussed by the Standards Committee which prefers the spelled out codes and values. They are easily converted E, O, B, Z when compatibility with NENA is desired.																		
4	Note the difference in how area/place names such as CTU, county, state, etc. vary between the address point standard and road centerline standard—currently, address points are told to be attributed based on where the points lie and road centerlines are told to be attributed based on the addresses (not where the location data geometry is located). The road centerline description seems accurate and I am satisfied with this description, but unsure of the address point attribution guidance.	Megan Sisko, State of MN	Noted																		
	Section 6. Cartographic Elements																				
5	6.2 Road Cartographic Class: Just one comment regarding the RoadCartoClassDomain. I would like the committee to consider reducing the number of proposed Cartographic classes. The reason behind this comment is an interest in matching available display classes for commercial mapping products. I suggest the following domain classes. <table border="1" data-bbox="168 860 693 1218"> <thead> <tr> <th>CODE</th> <th>VALUE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Freeway</td> <td>Freeway</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Primary</td> <td>Primary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secondary</td> <td>Secondary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local</td> <td>Local</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service</td> <td>Service/Alley/Private</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ramp</td> <td>Ramp</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicular Trail</td> <td>Vehicular Trail</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Walkway</td> <td>Non Vehicular</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CODE	VALUE	Freeway	Freeway	Primary	Primary	Secondary	Secondary	Local	Local	Service	Service/Alley/Private	Ramp	Ramp	Vehicular Trail	Vehicular Trail	Walkway	Non Vehicular	Vic Barnett, Ramsey County	Action: Remove “Other” from the domain but keep the remaining codes. Metadata and other documentation can be used to help show data users how to map these codes to other display classification systems.
CODE	VALUE																				
Freeway	Freeway																				
Primary	Primary																				
Secondary	Secondary																				
Local	Local																				
Service	Service/Alley/Private																				
Ramp	Ramp																				
Vehicular Trail	Vehicular Trail																				
Walkway	Non Vehicular																				

	Section 9. Business Elements		
6	<p>I apologize, I realized my suggestion to add “Gravel” to the road centerline surface type was a terrible idea. Technically speaking “Gravel” is a subset of “Aggregate” so having both options is redundant and or confusing. I my defense most people refer to all aggregates simply as gravel, especially those in the country. Please consider one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove “Gravel” 2. (Preferred) Rename “Aggregate” to “Aggregate/Gravel” This option includes the technical term as well as the standard nomenclature which may be easy for most people to understand. This is similar to the bikeways domain that includes “Aggregate/Crushed Stone” <p>Reference https://www.greenspec.co.uk/building-design/aggregates-for-concrete/ , https://alblairconstruction.com/crushed-stone-vs-gravel/</p>	Mark Volz, Lyon County	Action: consolidate “Gravel” and “Aggregate” into “Gravel/Aggregate” in the SurfaceType domain.
	General Comments		
7	<p>Page 6 says, “<i>Example: Address Number is a Mandatory field in this standard. If Address Number values are missing, the database does not comply with the Address Point Data Standard.</i>”</p> <p><i>Recommended change: “database” → “dataset”</i></p>	Megan Sisko, State of MN	Action: change “database” to “dataset” in the example for Mandatory inclusion.
8	<p>On page 6, underneath “Conditional”, change “Each field” → “Field” to match other descriptions. Also, for this example, preface with “Pre Directional is a conditional field in this standard.”</p>	Megan Sisko, State of MN	Action: Change “Each field” to “Field” for consistency. Change the example paragraph to: <i>Example: Pre Directional is a conditional field in this standard. A roadway “West Seventh Street” has a Pre Directional of “West”. The Pre Directional field applies to this feature. All road centerline segments for this street are required to have the Pre Directional field populated, but not the Post Directional field</i>
9	<p>Per the Standards Committee response to comment #15 from the Address Point Data Standard public review, the Standards Committee has decided to remove the “If Available” inclusion status from both the Road Centerline and Address Point standards.</p>	Standards Committee	Action: remove the If Available inclusion status from the Road Centerline Data Standard and change Effective Date and Impedance Speed to Optional.

9	<p>Comment: An exchange standard should enable the recipient to reconstruct the sender's file without loss of information. Road centerlines networks, to be useful in address data use and management, must be constructed as topological networks. To accomplish this purpose, the standard has to provide for exchange of the network geometry as well as the segment IDs and attributes. To reconstruct a road centerline network from exchange information I would need to know, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nodes, their coordinate positions, the segments they terminate, and their from-to status for segment they terminate. Without these I cannot know how the segments connect into routes or where they are located in space. • Segment shape points. If only nodes are given, the segments will be constructed as straight lines. The address points may be misaligned with the segments. • Topology rules. Necessary metadata to understand the rules and precision of the network connectivity; and valuable in checking any gaps introduced during export or import by, say, truncation of coordinate values. <p>Recommendation: Consider the purpose of the road centerline standard, and whether the purpose can be achieved if the road centerline network geometry is omitted.</p>	Ed Wells, Retired	Thank you for the comment. The Standards Committee will consider this in the future.
---	---	----------------------	--