

Attachment 2-2, Census Address Summit Agenda
 Thursday, September 8th, 2:00pm Address Maintenance and Sharing
 Small Group Break Out Session Worksheet

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Group #: 6</p> | <p>Group Members:</p> <p>Daniel Beaman, Laura Ermine, Jack Baker, Mike Dobson, Eileen Jacobs, Saskia Cohick</p> |
| <p>1. From your experience, what is the role of metadata in <u>address</u> data maintenance, quality, and sharing? Specifically, how does it</p> <p>a. help measure the quality of the data? b. impact the quality of the data itself? c. facilitate the sharing of data?</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and evaluate quality of MAF coverage • More research or definition and how they affect enumeration • Depends on metadata • Mailable, deliverable, locatable, geocodable, cuts out hard to find | |
| <p>2. What are the most pressing issues that your respective organizations currently face with address maintenance? Address data sharing?</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same addresses but different properties (different parcels, adjacent) • Assessor office handled for billing “ a whack a mole approach” • Conflicting requirements • E911 address systems built without funding – turnover in emergency responders • Georgia law to participate in BAS – mandated but not enforced • Reactionary not proactive • System imperfect for finding people • Not always a cohesive plan that spans the needs of users and uses • Consensus needed | |
| <p>3. If funding were not a consideration, what would you propose to improve address development in your respective organization(s)?</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully fund the ACS and MAF • Aerial updates (annual) • Education on Census purpose – bring people to meets and pay for travel • Roadside imagery • Flag hard to count • Research agenda to discover if MAF coverage is good • Focus on rural addresses • Community organization • Automation that does away with “one person knowledge | |

