

## Test Project Plan

### Federal/State/Local Address Coordination

What – project purpose and description?
<p><b>Overall Goal</b> (broad intention/ not tangible/ cannot be validated) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To create a formalized model, at the State level, to allow for the development, maintenance, and bi-directional sharing of high quality multiple use address data</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Objectives</b> (narrow and precise/ tangible and measurable/ can be validated/contribute to the fulfillment of specified goal):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To define a set of best practices, processes, role and responsibilities</b></li> <li>• <b>Develop a process that results in Statewide, seamless address data of the highest quality</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Scope</b> (things explicitly included or excluded such as geographic entities, levels of entities, types of data):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Three or four States to pilot</b></li> <li>• <b>Local representation, State and Federal</b></li> <li>• <b>Inclusion of stakeholder organizations (NSGIC, URISA, NENA, APCO, APA, NAPSG)</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Project Tasks/ Summary of Activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open communications</li> <li>• Registry of contact names</li> <li>• Census Bureau to share government contact/participation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Success Criteria</b> (How will success be measured? Is there consideration for whether the objectives have been met and if goal has been fulfilled? Can the pilot be considered a success if only a portion of the objectives are met?):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To have a set of best practices and adaptable, repeatable processes</b></li> <li>• <b>Development of a metrics at all levels</b></li> <li>• <b>100% participation is not necessary for success</b></li> </ul>

Group Members: Rachel Bello, Saskia Thompson, Jaime Powers, Rob Surber, Joe Sewash, Bill Johnson, Michael Fashway, Stuart Irby

<b>Why –pros/cons/overall implications</b>
<p><b>Positive Impacts Expected from conducting project:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reduced duplication of effort</b></li> <li>• <b>More high quality MAF data for all users (E-911, etc)</b></li> <li>• <b>Continual flow of high quality data (every 10 years will not stink so bad, less prep work for Census, LUCA)</b></li> <li>• <b>Communication</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Negative Impacts Expected from conducting project:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Politics – uphill battle getting buy-in</b></li> <li>• <b>Budget impacts</b></li> <li>• <b>Will not achieve 100% participation</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Constraints (policy barriers/ perceived funding shortcomings/ political considerations/other):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Funding</b></li> <li>• <b>Loss of authority for locals</b></li> <li>• <b>Perception</b></li> <li>• <b>Licensing/confidentiality for data</b></li> <li>• <b>“That’s not my mission” syndrome</b></li> </ul>

<b>How – basic requirements to make the project possible</b>
<p><b>Participants (direct, indirect, and peripheral participants):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Must be equal at all levels – local, state, federal, E-911, GIS, addressing officials, code enforcement, all department knowledge – make sure all facets of government are included to ensure data will work for everyone</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Resources Required (time/people – expertise/technology/funding/other):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lots of time</b></li> </ul>

Group Members: Rachel Bello, Saskia Thompson, Jaime Powers, Rob Surber, Joe Sewash, Bill Johnson, Michael Fashway, Stuart Irby

- **Sharepoint**
- **GIS technology**
- **Repository for document sharing**
- **Travel budget**

**Administrative Infrastructure** (What/Whom are needed to manage the project start-to-finish?):