

# Montana Addresses: Challenges & Best Practices

Michael Fashoway  
Montana Base Map Service Center  
U.S. Census Address Summit  
September 8, 2011



# Challenges

- My own lack of experience with addressing
- No single source for addresses in State gov
- No State standards and little coordination for addressing in Montana (at this time)
- Montana is largely rural
- Lack of resources at many local governments
- In some cases, a reluctance to share GIS address databases



# Challenges

- E911 address vs. Postal address
- Structure point vs. access point
- Multiple GIS / E911 / rural addressing vendors
- All this means just about every address database, if available, is different
  - Schema / attributes
  - Completeness
  - Accuracy (spatial and attribute)



# Challenges

- Montana originally mapped structure points with centroids derived from tax parcels, then adjusted to the structure using NAIP imagery
  - Time consuming
  - Not easy to update
  - Structure identification/classification
  - Dept of Revenue addresses



# Current Process

- Replace existing structures points with structure/address data from local government
- Using FME Desktop, create translation (parse, concatenate, change case, populate some missing attributes, change projection, etc.) and load addresses into ArcSDE database
- Schedule updates based on the local government and how much change they experience – 3 months, 6 months, yearly



# “Best Practices”

- Unique identifier – 3 parts
  - Provider ID
  - Dataset ID (STR or ADP)
  - Record ID

“99049000.STR.{4158A041-8767-472E-AB3B-3AC2B8160DA9}”
- Address components:
  - BuildingNumber (integer)
  - RoadName (includes any prefix, suffix, type) (string)
  - Community (string)
  - State (string)
  - Zipcode (string)
- Planning to further refine address components (to FGDC Street Address Standard?)



# Successes

- Addresses for 29 / 56 counties
- Have worked with several counties to clean and/or standardize their attribute data
- Currently working with one county to add their addresses (located on the road) to our structure points
- One county is participating in the USPS County Project
- NTIA Broadband address file grant



# Lessons Learned

- Not all local data is suitable for addressing (geocoding) due to missing address elements
- There is a need for standards but a lack of resources at local governments to adopt them
- Make it easy for local governments to share
- Offer assistance to local governments to help with cleaning / standardizing addresses

