

NJ Geospatial Forum- Address Task Force
Meeting Minutes
April 30, 2014

Participants:

Montgomery Twp	Patrick McDonald
Census Bureau	David Kraiker
Monmouth County	Chris Klaube
Behar Surveying	Ronen Rybowski
Address Access	Burt Ray Simpson
Mercer County	Janel Bisacquino
Brick Twp MUA	Chris McClain
Civil Solutions	Steven Eckhardt
NJ OIT OGIS	Andy Rowan, Doug Schleifer
Esri	Seth Van Aken

Location

Room 402, Riverview 300, Trenton, NJ

Agenda

- **Purpose of the meeting** – Initial task force meeting to establish mission, scope, and problem definition.
- **Presentation outline of major task force items** (Powerpoint slides):
 - I. Identifying the Needs of Stakeholders
 - II. Inventory of Existing Data Sources
 - III. Standards & Procedures Acceptance
 - IV. Identify Funding & Other Resources
 - V. Developing Data Validation & Aggregation Tools
 - VI. Publishing Statewide Resources
- **Roundtable Discussion**
 - Discussion of existing standards
 - Discussion of ultimate project scope
 - Discussion of existing data sources

Meeting Notes

Discussion of Stakeholder needs:

--Major difference is Public Safety needs **vs** Public Function needs. With Public Safety needs anything and everything including landmarks and subaddresses are important, although 'nice to know' if a particular address is official. With Public function needs (for mailing functions, official correspondence) validity of official addresses is very important
*Important to adopt a standard that incorporates both needs

Discussion of address assignment methodology

-Burt S described how address assignments methodology in local government is too idiosyncratic
-Who assigns official addresses depends on the local jurisdiction, varies across the state

Discussion of available data sources

-Best available sources involve local jurisdictions: counties, townships, PSAPs
-Most counties will provide the clearinghouse functions and roll data up to the state.

Some will not and will need to be supplemented at the state level.

-Census Bureau will not be able to share their data- Supreme Ct decision(site address included under restrictions)

Discussion of Standards

-Existing standards from FGDC, NENA

-**FGDC** (US Thoroughfare, Landmark & Address Postal Standard) – standard does not discuss spatial methods and point placement, only attributes

-**NENA** (NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model)- standard incorporates point type and subaddresses as well as attributes. Still in draft form

-**NENA** (Site/Structure Address Point Mapping Standard) working group headed by coordinator of NYS SAM project is working on a standard that will address point placement, point type, and access point methods.

-Andy R- FGDC model prefers attributes in complete form (ex"North") as opposed to USPS Pub 28 address attribute standard that prefers abbreviations (ex"N")

-More discussion is needed on a standard that will meet all stakeholder needs and fit geocoding models.

Discussion of address point creation methodologies

-David K described how the Census bureau uses a mixed approach in address point creation; field collected points as well as points generated from parcel centroids. Field collected points currently vary widely in accuracy. Census Bureau interested in both official (mailing) addresses and any site/structure subaddresses.

-Many other organizations including state OGIS, Sussex County, Morris County & Monmouth County used parcel and building centroids in their initial build of an address points layer.

-Monmouth County- initial address points supplemented with fire agency building-unit plans and property management agency plans.

-Patrick M- Montgomery used parcels as well as hard copy address maps to digitize address pts and address points assigned from subdivision maps.

-Ronen R discussed the possibility of using crowd sourced and citizen volunteered data.

-Andy R discussed the importance of identifying the address authority for each jurisdiction

-Seth V discussed the value of using a distributed address point workflow to allow rollup of county address points to the state. Distributed address point methodology using geodata service should be continued and further refined. Technology is available to allow local address authorities the ability to edit county address points on ArcGISOnline (ex. Sussex County)

Discussion of project scope

-Although it was agreed that current address naming methods were dysfunctional, changing the rules for official address assignments and naming conventions most likely out of the scope of this project.

Action Items

-Task force members will reach out to colleagues on inputs and invitations to join the project

-Chris K will send out a listserv notification on suggested meeting times for May

-Chris K will work on a collaborative project site for the task force

Next Meeting

We would like to have the next meeting very soon in May in order to agree upon deliverables and begin assigning tasks.