



## Minnesota Geospatial Advisory Council

Standards Committee, Metro Address Work Group &  
NextGen9-1-1 Work Group



Comments received on the proposed  
**ADDRESS POINT STANDARD**

**Comments received during the 60-Day Public Comment and  
Stakeholder Review Period: July 24, 2017 – September 22, 2017**

*Published: September 26, 2017*

Mark Sloan, Clay County, Minnesota  
Received August 15, 2017

Submitting comments on behalf of reviewers from  
Clay County, MN  
City of Moorhead, MN  
Fargo, ND  
Cass County, ND

- **Page 5 (2.8) – “NOTE:” refers to the “National” standard that requires mixed case for the street name. Is the “National” standard mentioned the NENA standard? We also have concerns about the mixed case. We believe the Minnesota Next Generation 911 GIS Data Standards has all upper case. We believe these standards should match. We prefer all upper case.**
- **Page 6 (2.9 & 2.10) – We have the same question about whether the “National” standard being referenced is the NENA standard? We believe the Minnesota Next Generation 911 GIS Data Standards is using the Post Office PUB 28 abbreviations. We believe these standards should match. We prefer the PUB 28 abbreviations over spelling them out completely.**
- **Page 3 (2.2) – We have concerns that the field length for the ANUMBER field is too small. We believe a Long integer field type would be sufficient providing 10 digits. We believe keeping the field at 6 digits may cause issues by being too small.**
- **Appendix A (5.6 Placement Method) – Code 5 the word “entrance” is misspelled as “entrace”.**

**August 28, 2017**

**Caitlin Christenson**, Stevens County

I just have a couple concerns/issues/questions. The first being is there a standard on where the address point is placed? If so I think it should be noted in the FAQ section. The second is that the street pre-directional, post type and post directional are spelled out rather than being postal abbreviated which I thought that was NENA standard. If you have any questions please let me know.

Thank you,  
Caitlin Christenson

**Caitlin Christenson**

GIS Technician

(320) 208-6578 office

Stevens County

400 Colorado Ave. Suite 302, Morris, MN, 56267

**August 28, 2017**

**Chelsey Bagent**

GIS Specialist  
Swift County

Here are my comments about the proposed Address Point Standard. I hope they are useful.

**Database Fields/Schema:**

- Should the field ST\_PRE\_TYP have the same domain as the field ST\_POS\_TYP?
- The fields ST\_PRE\_TYP and FIELD ST\_POS\_TYP should have the same width.
- The fields ST\_PRE\_MOD and ST\_POS\_MOD should have the same width.
- Subaddress fields – these do not fully cover the purpose of the fields Building, Floor, Unit, Room, and Seat.
  - Part of their purpose is to be able to easily and quickly drill down to a specific spot in a building in an emergency situation and these subaddress fields do not allow for that.
  - I would caution against having these subaddress fields replace the specific location fields.
- It would be more straightforward to have two fields and domains that replace the current placement method field.
  - Placement Location:
    - Driveway Access
    - Building
    - Building Doorstop
    - Building Unit Location
    - Within Parcel
    - Other
    - Etc.
  - Placement Method:
    - Centroid Calculation
    - Aerial Imagery
    - GPS
    - Plat
    - Other
    - Etc.
- Legacy Street Name Fields
  - I think they should be included as optional fields for those that want to maintain their street names differently than this standard recommends.
  - They may also be helpful during the transition period to map data based MSAGs.

**Domains:**

- It should be **DEGRAFF** without a space.
- Placement Method should include (if not changed to the above suggestion):
  - Aligned to building based on aerial photo.

- GPS at driveway access
- GPS at structure

**Metadata:**

- The documentation should include a description of what the metadata specifications are.

Let me know if you have any questions about any of my comments.

Thank you,  
**Chelsey Bagent**  
GIS Specialist  
Swift County

Courthouse | Land Records Office  
301 14th Street N | PO Box 207 | Benson, MN 56215  
Office: 320-314-8366 | Fax: 320-843-6105  
[chelsey.bagent@co.swift.mn.us](mailto:chelsey.bagent@co.swift.mn.us) | <http://www.swiftcounty.com>  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/SwiftCountyMN](http://www.facebook.com/SwiftCountyMN)



# CITY OF CHANHASSEN

Chanhassen is a Community for Life - Providing for Today and Planning for Tomorrow

September 21, 2017

Standards Committee, MnGeo  
658 Cedar Street, Room 300  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: Proposed Address Point Standard

Dear Standards Committee, MnGeo:

Please find below comments submitted from the City of Chanhassen in regards to the proposed Address Point Standard:

1. A concatenated field for the entire address would assist in geocoding addresses and integrating with various enterprise applications. We would like to propose the inclusion of a concatenated full address field with the new address point standard.
2. An additional secondary landmark name would be beneficial if a location has more than one landmark name. We would like to propose a second landmark name field.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Lott-Havey  
GIS Specialist

CITY OF CHANHASSEN

**From:** Karla Culhane [<mailto:kculhane@DuluthMN.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 22, 2017 8:37 AM  
**To:** MNGeo, GISinfo (ADM) (MNIT) <[GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us](mailto:GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Address Point Data Standard for Minnesota - City of Duluth, MN Comments

Geoffrey,

Thank you for the ability to review the proposed address point data standard. Our addressing team has reviewed the proposed standard and have a couple of questions/comments that we hope you will take under advisement to address as you finalize the standard.

- How can new records be added to the standard tables (ie. new Address Post Type for instance Entr for Entrance)
- How will this standard handle alias street names? (ie. London Rd vs State Hwy 61 or W Michigans St vs. Bob Dylan Dr)

Please contact me with any additional questions you may have regarding our submission.

Sincerely,

*Karla Culhane*  
Manager, IT  
City of Duluth, MN  
411 W 1<sup>st</sup> St Rm 210A  
Duluth MN 55802  
218-730-5119  
[kculhane@duluthmn.gov](mailto:kculhane@duluthmn.gov)



This transmission is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law.



**From:** Mark Volz [<mailto:MarkVolz@co.lyon.mn.us>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 24, 2017 9:41 AM  
**To:** Iten, Adam (MNIT) <[adam.iten@state.mn.us](mailto:adam.iten@state.mn.us)>; Geoffrey Maas <[Geoffrey.Maas@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Geoffrey.Maas@metc.state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** FW: Minnesota Address Point Standard for Public Review

Adam and Geoffrey,

Quick question. I am confused by this e-mail here for a couple reasons.

1. I thought the NG9-1-1 Address Standard is intended to be the “master” Statewide Address Point Standard. This is the reason why we heavily discussed the “Minnesota Added Fields” and whenever it made scene we included fields from the Metro Address Point Standard.
2. The NG9-1-1 Address Standard is not finalized yet so is it too early use the NG9-1-1 Address Standard as a source for the statewide standard?

Anyways, maybe I am missing something here, but my thoughts are that as a county I only want to deal with one standard. I think that publishing two address point standards will only result in confusion, frustration, and more work. I strongly recommend that we work together so that we can publish a single standard that will meet both Geoffrey’s needs and those for NG9-1-1.

Thank You!

Sincerely,

**Mark Volz, GISP**

**Lyon County GIS Coordinator**

[504 Fairgrounds Rd](#)

[Marshall, MN 56258](#)

Ph: (507) 532-8218

Fax: (507) 532-8217

<http://lyonco.org/>

<http://geomoose.lyonco.org/>



I have some concerns if the plan is to have us first adopt the NG9-1-1 specifications, then have us transfer to the Statewide Address Point Dataset.

- I am under the impression that the NG9-1-1 specifications are only transitional and that they will be replaced by the MN Address Point Standard. If that is the case then, there are several fields in the NG9-1-1 specification that require LOTS of manual work to fill out that are not included in the MN Address Point Standard. We should either 1) remove these fields from NG9-1-1 now, or 2) include them in the Statewide Address Point Dataset. **I do not want to take time to fill out any fields, only to have them be discarded almost immediately.** Some examples:
  - BUILDING, FLOOR, UNIT, ROOM, SEAT
  - PLACE\_TYPE
  - ELEVATION
  - EXCEPTION
- There are some minor schema changes that really could and should be resolved now.
  - Should we use CO\_NAME or COUNTY? We may as well use one name to describe the County name now. There are a couple other fields with this issue MUNI\_NAME / CTU\_NAME, GNIS\_ID / MUNI\_CODE, STATE\_CODE / STATE.
  - Some of the field names are slightly different including but not limited to RESIDENCE(8 or 10), UNIQUE\_ID (36, 38)
  - There are some cases where the Database Name matches the Field Name however, the Element Name does not match the Descriptive Name. The one I noticed right away is Zip Code.
  - Note \*I did not inspect any specific domain entries yet... I first want to see what is your general opinion of this e-mail.
- I would prefer to build my geoprocessing scripts once.
- I don't have to tell my clients that "Oh although you just paid to have me upgrade to the NG9-1-1 specs, we now need to make some changes to the schema right off the bat so that your data matches the statewide specs".

**In conclusion, I think that the schema between the two datasets are so close to each other that we may as well match the field name, width, descriptions. In addition, if the NG9-1-1 specs are truly only transitional then we need to review any attributes that are part of NG9-1-1 but not the state specifications. I think many counties will be very annoyed if they populate some of these manual fields only to have them discarded in the near future.**

After speaking with my IT Administrator about this issue, we decided to work on a compromise that I hope will work. The goal that I have is to still create a **single** dataset so that that will serve the needs of the Minnesota Address Point Standards as well as the MN NG9-1-1 address point standard. I call it the

“Transitional Address Point Standard.” I think this will best serve us and our clients because we will not have to recreate geoprocessing scripts or maps because of minor changes in the schema.

I decided that I am going to use the Minnesota Address Point Standard for the field names, descriptions, width, etc. Here are some of the key points of the “Transitional Address Point Standard”

- There is no point to use a field called “COUNTY” if it ultimately will become “CO\_NAME.” It is my understanding that the state can accept fields with different names for NG9-1-1.
- For the unique ID, whom will be responsible for adding the brackets to the UNIQUE\_ID. One standard has a width of 36, while the other 38. I’m guessing the state can accept either format.
- I have not inspected the differences, but I hope that the domains are indeed compatible between NG9-1-1 and the state specs.
- Any optional variables that are part of NG9-1-1, but not part of MN will NOT be included, that is unless I decide that we have a business need to keep those variables beyond the transition to the MN state standard. For example I don’t think I need ELEVATION in my dataset, however I want to include PLACE\_TYPE in some format even if it is not part of the MN Address Point Standard.
- What do I do with the field EXCEPTION? It is a mandatory field in NG9-1-1, but not even included in the Address Point Standard. That to me tells me that it is either 1) Missing from the MN Standard, 2) Not really mandatory, or 3) a transitional or legacy attribute and therefore should be called LST\_EXCEPT or similar?
- I understand some the need to temporary keep some of the legacy NG9-1-1 attributes such as LST\_NAME.

I really wish that some of the minor schema differences could be resolved now. I don’t care one bit if we use “COUNTY” or “CO\_NAME”. However, it will be a pain if I get some data from neighbors where one uses “COUNTY” and others use “CO\_NAME.” It will also be a pain if I need to create all my maps using “COUNTY” in the definition query, then have to adjust them again to “CO\_NAME.” I know conceptually the name change sounds really easy, but in practice it will be a pain. I have not found a decent way to change the underlying field names in ESRI, it will be a pain to upgrade Geoprocessing scripts, it will be a pain if one county uses one field name and the other does not. I really think it would simplify life if tossed a coin and picked a name format for some of these “close but not the same” fields.

Sincerely,

**Mark Volz, GISP, Lyon County GIS Coordinator**

[504 Fairgrounds Rd](#)

[Marshall, MN 56258](#)

Ph: (507) 532-8218

Fax: (507) 532-8217

<http://lyonco.org/> - <http://geomoose.lyonco.org/>



METROPOLITAN EMERGENCY  
SERVICES BOARD  
2099 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST  
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 55104-3431

PHONE 651-643-8395  
WWW.MN-MESB.ORG

The Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB) supports the efforts of the Geospatial Advisory Council to create a statewide multi-use address point standard. We appreciate the years of effort that went in to creating a standard that meets multiple business needs, including those of the 9-1-1 system.

It is the view of the MESB that this standard will meet the needs of the 9-1-1 system, with one exception, a domain is needed for Sub Address Types.

- In order to convert FGDC sub address elements into the United States Civic Location Data Exchange Format (CLDXF) used in 9-1-1 systems, a domain is needed for sub address types. Use of a domain will allow for standardized mapping of the sub address elements to those required in the CLDXF format used for 9-1-1 purposes. We propose using USPS standard sub address types as a start for this domain. This domain does not need to be limited to USPS sub address type, and may be supplemented to meet county or agency business needs. We suggest adding the CLDXF designation of Seat, as well as Ramp, Garage and Skyway, which are known to be in use in the Metro area. The complete list of USPS values and recommended additional values follow on page 2.

Two additional recommendations are not required for the 9-1-1 system, but are offered as suggestions for address point data management:

- Add an optional field for address type. This field may include domain values such as:
  - o **Infrastructure** for Utility addresses
  - o **Primary** for a building address without a sub address designation
  - o **Secondary** for sub addresses with unit designations
  - o **Provisional** for addresses added before they are confirmed as official
  - o **Unofficial** for addresses that are not approved by the addressing authority, but are known to be in use
  - o **ParcelSitus** for parcels where the Parcel situs address is also duplicated by a doorway address on that parcel; It allows for managing parcel and site structure addresses in the same data set
- Add a second optional attribute for CAD Address. This would designate which addresses would be loaded into a Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD). There are no CAD systems available today that can geo-verify an address to the sub address level. It would meet a strong business need for PSAPs to be able to create an address point data set for use in their CAD where each point is unique with regard to: Address Number, Address Number Suffix, Street Name Elements, and City. Adding this field could also benefit any user of the dataset not needing address points down to the sub address level.

Proposed Domain for Sub Address Types

<b>Code</b>	<b>Value</b>
Apartment	Apartment
Basement	Basement
Building	Building
Department	Department
Floor	Floor
Front	Front
Garage	Garage
Hanger	Hanger
Key	Key
Lobby	Lobby
Lot	Lot
Lower	Lower
Office	Office
Penthouse	Penthouse
Pier	Pier
Ramp	Ramp
Rear	Rear
Room	Room
Seat	Seat
Skyway	Skyway
Side	Side
Slip	Slip
Space	Space
Stop	Stop
Suite	Suite
Trailer	Trailer
Unit	Unit
Upper	Upper

**From:** Brower, Susan (ADM)  
**Sent:** Friday, September 22, 2017 3:48 PM  
**To:** MNGeo, GISinfo (ADM) (MNIT) <[GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us](mailto:GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** Minnesota Proposed Address Point Standards

Dear Standards Committee,

I am writing to comment on the address point standards which are currently under review.

First, I would like to voice my support for including a field in the standards that would allow one to identify residential units. This information would enable my office to use the address data to produce improved population estimates which are, in turn, used to distribute state funds to local governments each year. The inclusion of this field would also improve our ability to conduct decennial census reviews on behalf of Minnesota. The federal government distributes more than 8 billion dollars of funding to Minnesota each year on the basis of census data, and having an accurate count of our residents begins with a complete and accurate count of all residences.

I am pleased to see that "Residence (Y/N/U)" is currently included in the proposed standards as an optional field. Please consider expanding the categories to include possible commercial and mixed-use responses. Because the residence field is so critical to a full and complete census count, please consider making it a mandatory or conditional element.

Second, I support the inclusion of an element that allows one to distinguish the number of units in a multi-unit building. It appears that this can be accomplished with the "SUB\_ID" fields. Please consider how the "Residence" field and "Subunit" fields might be jointly reported to identify whether units within a multi-unit building are residential or commercial.

Thank you for your consideration, and kudos to you for undertaking this important work.

Regards,

Susan Brower  
Minnesota State Demographer  
Minnesota Department of Administration  
658 Cedar Street, #300  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155  
651-201-2472  
[susan.brower@state.mn.us](mailto:susan.brower@state.mn.us)



Comments Received from Adam Iten, Emergency Communications Network  
On behalf of the NextGen9-1-1 Initiative

**Element 2.6 (ST\_PRE\_TYPE) - Mandatory**

Use Core Minnesota domain derived from USPS Publication 28, Appendix F

**Element 2.12 (SUB\_TYPE1) – Sub-Address Type**

Consider use of NG911/CLDXF subtype fields for domain (below)

**Element 2.14 (SUB\_TYPE2) – Sub-Address Type**

Consider use of NG911/CLDXF subtype fields for domain (below)

CODE	VALUE OR DEFINITION
BUILDING	BUILDING
FLOOR	FLOOR
UNIT	UNIT
ROOM	ROOM
SEAT	SEAT

**Element 2.16 (Zip Code) - Mandatory**

*Recommend **Conditional** in short term due to status of Greater MN data; should be eventually made Mandatory long term*

**Element 3.1 (MUNI\_NAME) - Mandatory**

*Recommend changing field name to **CTU\_NAME** due to unincorporated names in the domain and Greater MN counties are already using **CTU\_NAME** in both Road Centerlines and Address Points*

*Use full statewide domain of CTU names*

**Element 3.2 (MUNI\_CODE) - Mandatory**

*Change field name to **CTU\_ID\_CEN** to match the **GNIS\_FEATURE\_ID\_TEXT** field of the Minnesota CTU Database (note: others have recommended changing field name to **GNIS\_ID**)*

*Use full statewide domain of GNIS codes*

### **Element 3.3 (POSTCOMM)**

*Use full statewide domain USPS community names*

### **Element 3.4 (CO\_CODE)**

*Use full statewide domain of County Codes*

*Use COUNTY instead of CO\_CODE?*

### **Element 3.5 (CO\_NAME)**

*Use full statewide domain of County Names*

### **Element 3.6 (STATE\_CODE)**

*Use full NG911 domain (incl. Ontario & Manitoba) - see below*

<b>CODE</b>	<b>VALUE OR DEFINITION</b>
MN	Minnesota
WI	Wisconsin
IA	Iowa
SD	South Dakota
ND	North Dakota
ON	Ontario
MB	Manitoba

### **Element 5.3 (RESIDENCE)**

*Use NG911 domain (incl. Single & Multiple)*

<b>CODE</b>	<b>VALUE OR DEFINITION</b>
Yes	The address point contains a residence or living quarters but no indication is given as to whether it is a single or multiple residence.
Single	The address point contains a single-family residence or living quarters.
Multiple	The address point contains multiple family residences or living quarters.
No	The address point does not contain a residence or living quarters.
Unknown	It is unknown if the address contains a residence or living quarters or not.

**Element 5.6 (PLACEMETH) - Optional**

*Change field type to Long Integer*

**Element 6.1 (GISAUTH911) - Mandatory**

*Change field name to GIS911POC*

*Use NG911 domain (i.e. County Names & Red Lake Nation)*

**Element 6.3 (MSAG C)**

*Use NG911 domain (MSAG Community)*

**Element 7.1 (STATUS) - Optional**

*Recommend using same the same 'Feature Status' domain as MRCC and NG911*

CODE	VALUE OR DEFINITION
Active	Feature Active
Retired	Feature Retired
Proposed	Feature Proposed
Planned	Feature Planned
Under Construction	Feature Under Construction
Out of Service	Feature Out of Service
Not Built	Feature Not Built

**Element 7.4 (SOURCE) - Optional**

These are non-911 fields; however, more clarity is necessary to understand the business needs; verify intended use with MRCC "Source" field

**Element 7.5 (AAUTHORITY) - Mandatory**

These are non-911 fields; however, more clarity is necessary to understand the business needs; also recommend changing to Optional

**Element 7.6 (EDIT ORG) - Optional**

These are non-911 fields; however, more clarity is necessary to understand the business needs



**Recommended to add the following new attributes:**

Country Code (**COUNTRY**), Text, Width: 2 – Optional

*Recommend adding country Code to the Proposed Standard*

Recommended domain values: US, CA

Exception (**EXCEPTION**), Text, Width: 10 – Mandatory

*Recommend adding EXCEPTION field due to strong business need for use in Quality Assurance*

Recommended domain values: Yes, No

**From:** Lusk, Todd [<mailto:Todd.Lusk@CO.DAKOTA.MN.US>]  
**To:** MNGeo, GISinfo (ADM) (MNIT) <[GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us](mailto:GISinfo.MNGeo@state.mn.us)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Address Point Standard Comments

### **Item 2.5 Street Name Pre Directional**

- It might be useful to provide some guidance on when a directional as a part of a street name is (or isn't) converted to be a "Pre Directional". For example, is any directional, regardless of how it is used the full street name, automatically converted to a "pre directional" (i.e., Does "North Shore Dr" become Pre Directional of "North" and Street Name of "Shore" and Post Type of "Drive"?).
- The USPS provides a little bit of guidance on how they handle situations like this: [https://pe.usps.com/text/pub28/28c2\\_014.htm](https://pe.usps.com/text/pub28/28c2_014.htm)

### **Item 3.3 Postal Community Name**

- It might be worth noting that there may be more than one "acceptable" postal community name. For example, in ZipCode 55124, the USPS "preferred" name is "SAINT PAUL", but they also list "APPLE VALLEY" as acceptable. Because many people are confused when they see "55124" and "SAINT PAUL", Dakota County prefers to use "APPLE VALLEY" for points that fall in the 55124 ZipCode rather than UPSS' "preferred" value of "SAINT PAUL".

Todd

#### **Todd Lusk**

Senior GIS Specialist  
Dakota County Office of GIS  
14955 Galaxie Ave  
Apple Valley, MN 55124  
USNG: 15T VK 8340 5336  
Direct: (952) 891-7084  
Fax: (952) 891-7097  
Office: (952) 891-7081