

Attendees: Janet Lowe, Alex Rickard, Bill Shinar, Kai Monast, Greg Ferrara, Zsolt Nagy, Tom Morgan, Daniel VanLiere, David Giordano, Julia Harrell (phone), Julie Stamper (phone), Donna Wright (phone), Karen Kelly (phone)

Schema/Standard Review

Janet indicated the goal is for the ability of state road data and local data to be seamless statewide for all to use. The challenge thus far has been combining the two systems of geocoding and linear referencing into one cohesive dataset. Alex added the original standard was written in 2005.

The current standard is not a mandate. Groups are encouraged to adhere to the standard if they are going to share data with someone else. The new standard will be more than a content standard, it will be a schema-based standard, meaning that there will be data structure and rules (topology and domain) associated with it. The recommendations of the new schema standard are:

1. Unique IDs – for every street and street segment
2. Length
3. Topology rules
4. Routing fields
 - a. One Way values
 - b. Elevation values
 - c. Speed (used to determine cost for routing, not posted speed limit)
5. Centerline best practices

Kai asked why is routing optional. Janet said that some local governments don't collect this data. Donna suggested inserting the Emergency Service Numbers (ESN) which would be used for 911 routing. Janet added that for dispatching purposes streets are segmented at ESN boundary.

Tom suggested putting supplemental documents as an addendum. This keeps the document from being cluttered. This standard is different from the existing one in that it will enable users to join business tables based on the, street address ranges, mile markers, or unique ID. Each street will have a unique street identifier and each street segment (e.g. those produced by street intersections) will also have a unique identifier.

As far as migrating the current standard to the new one, the following changes are proposed:

1. Administrative changes to the text
 - a. WGRT revision statement July 2009
2. Remove Section 2 definition
3. Clarify/simplify Section 3
4. Clarify/simplify Section 4
 - a. Too academic
 - b. Rework as a topology section
5. Section 5
 - a. Add suggested field names
 - b. Remove second table
 - c. Shade routing fields
6. Move metadata to the end of the document, include as a separate document, or add as an appendix

Julia suggested adding real-world, everyday English to explain sections that warrant it. She also suggested using OGC topology definitions as a standard. Alex offered that the standard should support common applications and use those

rules/terminology that 90% of the counties use. Tom asked if the schema committee had determined whether the FGDC had updated their transportation standard. Janet responded no, but the committee would follow up with that.

CAP Grant Discussion

Alex indicated the pursuit of a CAP grant to assist in building a data translator would be due in January 2010. Prior to that the steps to pursue a CAP grant would require GICC approval at their November 2009 meeting, SMAC approval at their October 2009 meeting, and LGC and SGUC approval in their August 2009 meetings.