

**Minutes**  
**LGSIC Data Standards Committee**  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room DEQ  
March 21, 2006

**In attendance:** Bo Blackmon (DNR)      Joe Holmes (DEQ)  
                         David Gisclair (LOSCO)      Craig Johnson (LAGIC)  
                         Marty Beasley (DOA)      Joshua Kent (LAGIC)

**Discussion Items:**

- 1) David Gisclair (LOSCO) noted that the CIO is waiting for the GIS Council to recommend addressing standards and an addressing scheme that could be adopted by all state agencies. He noted that the CISD has been looking at postal addressing standards.
- 2) Marty Beasley (DOA) noted that the issue of addresses is really two issues; the address itself and the map to which it must be linked to allow geo-coding.
- 3) Bo mentioned the need for software to parse legacy address databases to be able to port them to a standard addressing scheme.
- 4) Joe Holmes noted the capabilities for address geo-coding built into ArcGIS and Model Builder.
- 5) Josh Kent noted that the Post Office CASS system is simply a method of validating deliverable addresses not an address standard. It is a valuable QA/QC tool.
- 6) Craig Johnson (LAGIC) noted that the URISA/NENA standard is in final draft and must go through a public review process by FGDC before it is finalized. That could take another 6 months.

The group reviewed the URISA/NENA standard and looked at the minimum required fields. It was agreed that the URISA/NENA standard may be “overkill” for Louisiana, but that it’s comprehensiveness should ensure that it is adopted at the federal level

The group felt that this standard should be adopted by state agencies. Agencies would not be required to convert their legacy addresses to the new standard, but would be advised to parse their address database in preparation for geo-coding. The state would look at providing address parsing assistance to those state agencies that did not have that capability.

After the address had been parsed and checked for deliverability (Postal Service, Cass certification) it would then be converted to an XML file. The addresses would then be geo-coded producing at minimum three new data fields; latitude, longitude and a unique identifier. The agencies IT shops would append the new data fields to their existing address database.