Address Workgroup Meeting Notes

Tuesday, December 18, 2012
10:00 to 12:00 AM
MESB/MMCD Offices, Room 227
2099 University Ave W., St. Paul

1. Attendees

Todd Sieben	Washington County
Marcia Broman	Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (contractor)
Gordon Chinander	Metropolitan Emergency Services Board
Jim Bunning	Scott County
Deb Jones	City of Falcon Heights
Joel Koepp	City of Roseville
Mark Kotz (chair)	Metropolitan Council
Paul Peterson	Metropolitan Council
Nancy Read	Metro Mosquito Control District
Joe Sapletal	Dakota County
Ben Verbick	LOGIS
Nate Christ	Carver County
Derek Lorbiecki	Hennepin County
Matt Koukol	Ramsey County
Cory Karsten	City of St. Paul
Bob Basques	City of St Paul
Will Craig	NSGIC outreach committee

1a. Note Taker

Verbick agreed to take meeting notes.

1b. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Approve Agenda

Agenda was approved with no changes.

3. Update on Web Editing Tool and Demo

Kotz offered a brief history of the editing tool and its evolution from a proof of concept developed by App Geo to its current state as a near production ready product from NorthPoint Geographics.

Sapletal demonstrated the capabilities of the product and also noted two unresolved issues; 1.) authentication into the application is still buggy, 2.) printing capabilities are not complete.

The product, as demonstrated was using a database and services hosted by Dakota County. Comments/questions made by the committee during the demonstration include...

- o Koepp – Standard shows data values are mixed case. Fields are caps. Sapletal – Dakota Co. chose to use upper case.
- o Chinander - Is there street name verification? Verbick – a domain can be created in the database for existing street names.
- o Jones – Can we see an example of multiple points per parcel? Sapletal demonstrated.
- o Verbick – Will Dakota County require use of this product by all addressing authorities within its hosting jurisdiction? Sapletal – yes. Primarily due to ease of use, direct access to the database, security.
- o Chinander – has point location best practices been discussed? It will need to be within a parcel in order to satisfy inclusion within an ESZ boundary. NENA prefers point on building. Others – Address workgroup has not authority to specify location practices, but a 911 authority could do that and address workgroup endorse it.

Sapletal wrapped up the demonstration with brief commentary. Generally very satisfied with the product.

Kotz asked for additional volunteers for address editor steering group. Lorbiecki accepted.

4. Web Editor Enhancements for 2013

Kotz suggested that the potential enhancement list be reviewed so money can be earmarked for this task in 2013.

Bunning noted that it will be necessary for his organization and others to perform formal security testing on the application prior to implementation. This is generally a thorough penetration test at a cost of about $2500.

Karsten asked about being able to see a log of changes on an address by address basis, including editor name and notes, instead of only the most recent change.

Upon review of the enhancement list and additional discussion the committee determined enhancements should be addressed in the following priority order.

1. Multipoint selection and updating.
2. Security testing
3. Session specific editing defaults

Action: Kotz to update these task priorities for funding request.

Basques asked if stacked address points are being considered.

Sapletal responded that Dakota Co just leaves them as stacked, but many labels are visible to show them. Cities may move them if desired.

Another question arose about capturing the Z value of addresses.

Kotz responded that Z value had been put into the MetroGIS data specs due to a lack of a viable standard.

5. Are there potential web app user cities without host counties?

Kotz asked the committee to identify possible cities without hosting counties and if MetC should consider hosting in those cases. None were identified at this time. The committee agreed that MetC could consider hosting if necessary but should hold off for now, since counties are generally interested in that role.

6. Implementation Update Roundtable

Kotz asked all to briefly comment on their outlook for implementation of the address points data.

Jones – City data is in progress. Had an intern that left for a job before work could be completed.

Broman – MESB will continue to work with counties and their implementation of the editor will be beneficial to MESB.

Bunning – Scott County is looking forward to evaluating/implementing editing tool when it is finished.

Lorbiecki – Hennepin County will bring the information gathered at this meeting to its development group who may be considering a similar product.

Chinander – Right track. Looking forward to rural county implementation.

Koepp – Roseville is continuing its address point initiative.

Verbick – several LOGIS member municipals have address point feature classes that have been built for internal business needs. Looking forward to standardizing datasets and maintenance as MetroGIS and Hennepin County move forward with current initiatives.

Koukol – Ramsey County continues address synchronization process working with addressing authorities. Looks forward to release of the editor.

Basquez – St Paul has developed an xml feed to offer address point data to MetC.

7. Outreach Effort – Showing Cities the "How" of Address Points

Jones offered a review of a ppt intended to assist addressing authorities in getting started with maintaining and support the regional address points dataset. She noted that it focuses on entities that may be at the very beginning of this effort and that it could be updated due to advancements in this initiative throughout 2012.

Kotz asked the committee if we should assume that metro area counties are completely on-board thus directing the cities to their respective counties for assistance.

Reed noted that the outreach document can be generalized considerably if cities are directed to counties.

Kotz asked for subcommittee volunteers to work with Jones on an outreach document and identifying and documenting workflow and integration tasks for addressing authorities. Koukol and Peterson volunteered.
Action: Koukol and Peterson will meet with Jones to continue this process.

9. Implementation Plan – do we need one?
Kotz asked the committee if an effort should be made to develop an implementation plan for the address points, editor and data flow.
Peterson suggested that a timeline might be more appropriate than a detailed implementation plan.
Reed suggested that interdependencies should be considered and documented.
Koukol suggested a framework for a step-by-step document that counties can modify for the specific needs of the addressing authorities.
Basques reiterated his interest in documented address evolution and data flow.

9. Review Action Items

See items highlighted above.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15