Technical Panel Meeting Agenda

Technical Panel
Tuesday, May 13, 2014 at 9:00 AM
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street
Lincoln, NE

Meeting Documents

9:00 AM	**1.** Roll Call, Meeting Notice & Open Meetings Act Information **2.** Public Comment **3.** Approval of Minutes* - March 11, 2014	Chair
9:15 AM	**4.** Enterprise Projects • Project Status Dashboard	A. Weekly
9:30 AM	**5.** Standards and Guidelines **A.** Affirm Posting for 30-Day Comment Period **1.** NITC 3-203: Elevation Acquisition using LiDAR Standards (New)* **2.** NITC 3-205: Street Centerline Standards (New)* **3.** NITC 3-206: Address Standards (New)* **B.** Approval of Revised Attachment • NITC 1-204: IT Procurement Review Policy - Attachment A (Amendment)	R. Becker
9:45 AM	**6.** Work Group Updates and Other Business	Chair
10:00 AM	**7.** Adjourn (Next Meeting - June 10, 2014)	Chair

* Denotes action items

The Technical Panel will attempt to adhere to the sequence of the published agenda, but reserves the right to adjust the order of items if necessary and may elect to take action on any of the items listed.

Meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on April 3, 2014. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on May 9, 2014. Nebraska Open Meetings Act

TECHNICAL PANEL
Tuesday, March 11, 2014 at 9:00AM
Varner Hall - Board Room
3835 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, NE
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Walter Weir, CIO, University of Nebraska, Chair
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska
Jayne Scofield, OCIO, State of Nebraska
Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools
Michael Winkle, NET

ROLL CALL, MEETING NOTICE & OPEN MEETINGS ACT INFORMATION

Mr. Weir called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. A quorum existed to conduct official business. The meeting notice was posted to the NITC website and Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar on March 4, 2014. The agenda was posted to the NITC website on March 7, 2014. Nebraska Open Meetings Act was posted on the south wall.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 11, 2014 MINUTES

Mr. Langer moved to approve the February 11, 2014 minutes as presented. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Scofield-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and Winkle-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

Project Update – NDE, Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA)
Valorie Foy, John Moon, and Brent Gaswick, Nebraska Department of Education

Ms. Foy provided the report. The project contractor is Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). The new engine is called INSIGHT and has been updated. The writing test program is a new system. Currently, approximately 98% of students are taking the writing assessment online. English as a Second Language and special needs students, or students who are in a facility where online testing is not available are taking the paper assessment test. In the writing assessment test, the project found there was no loss of text due to the outage but that the tab formatting did lose some text. The January outage which was reported in the Lincoln newspaper was due to an issue at DRC. The program now has a load tester. The project has been working with the ESU Network Operations Consortium and Network Nebraska. DRC did testing with OPS and LPS. White screens were due to wide-area network in the schools. Caching at the school level was also an issue. The schools servers sit in the school districts and not at the state. DRC along with NDE is investigating the error reports for Testing Site Manager (TSM), the replacement caching system for Local Caching System (LCS), in the Updated INSIGHT engine. The project has a communication system set up with the school districts.

The panel members were given an opportunity to ask questions or provide input.

- The project needs to consider the user's experience and psychological affect as well not only the technical issue. Testing has not gone as well as expected.
- It appears that the TSM has issues whenever changes needed to be made.
- Ms. Horn expressed accessibility concerns with the test. Braille is available but some students do not read braille. Ms. Horn recommended the project look at accommodations such as taped text books for the testing.

- Has any consideration been given to putting the assessment testing on Network Nebraska?
- DRC has been helpful in the remediation process. DRC is handling the whole project now with no subcontractors.
- Should some aspects of the project really be noted as "yellow" rather than "green"?
- Final payment has not been made to the vendor.
- It was recommended that the project complete the Lessons Learned Form for Phase 1 of the project.

Ms. Foy thanked Lincoln Public Schools, Omaha Public Schools and Millard Public Schools districts for assistance. The user experience has been a priority concern. She stated that there are a lot of states going to online testing and that Nebraska is farther along than most.

Voluntary Review Project Closure*- Nebraska State Patrol, AFIS Upgrade

Mr. Weekly reported that the project began voluntarily reporting last June. The project went live in December. The project reported the following lessons learned:
What went wrong?

- Few milestones were not met
- Final completion was 2 weeks late due to java issues

What went right?

- Great communication
- Clearly defined implementation plan including buy-in and expectations
- Biweekly status meetings and then to weekly as go-live date neared

The project stated the form was easy to fill out and recommended that the form be online.

Mr. Winkle moved to designate the AFIS Upgrade project as a "closed" project. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Winkle-Yes Scofield-Yes, Horn-Yes, Langer-Yes, Weir-Yes, and. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

Project Status Dashboard
Andy Weekly

There were 8 project updates reported. The status of these projects remained the same. Mr. Weekly provided a brief overview of each project. Lessons learned have been compiled. There is a linkon the Technical Panel's website.

INCOMMON PILOT PROJECT UPDATE
Mike Danahy (via conference phone) and Scott Isaacson

The overall goals of the project are to make technology more accessible, easier to use, easier to manage and make it more secure. Identity management definition consists of three components:

- Authentication (are you who you say you are?)
- Personal data (what do we know about you? name, role(s) in your organization, other defining information)
- Authorization (what are you allowed to access?)

Independent user accounts have been set for different services available. Almost all school districts and higher educational institutions have their own file servers. Attempts to consolidate information all in one location is challenging. Before the concept of confederation was being considered, the Educational Service Unit technical staff decided to establish an LDAP Work Group. The vision of the LDAP Work Group was to link directory systems statewide and to develop common schema extensions and practices to consolidate identities. There are some single sign-on systems in the state.

The InCommon Pilot Project has reached national recognition. Nebraska is one of eight K-12 pilot states exploring and defining what InCommon membership will look like for K-12 institutions. Currently, the

University of Nebraska has four campuses and Central Administration that are InCommon participants. There are initial conversations with Wayne State, Northeast and Southeast Community Colleges. There are five Educational Service Units and four service providers identified to test federation. The federation idea builds on the concept of a common framework of trust without matching up directories. Directories can be different but have agreed upon attributes and requirements. Security is vital and needs a high degree of collaboration with K-12 and higher institutions. Partnerships and collaboration are important building blocks.

Lincoln Public Schools and ESU2 are doing service provider testing. Mr. Weir commended Mr. Danahy and Mr. Isaacson for their work.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Waivers - Revoke waivers which are no longer needed due to changes to NITC 8-301: Password Standard.*

Mr. Hobbs indicated that because the password standard was revised recently, several previously granted password waivers could be revoked: (1) Game & Parks waiver granted on January 8, 2008; (2) Department of Correctional Services waiver granted on April 8, 2008; (3) Kronos Steering Committee waiver granted on February 14, 2012; and (4) Department of Correctional Services waiver granted on September 10, 2013.

Mr. Winkle moved to revoke the four waivers. Ms. Horn seconded. Roll call vote: Weir-Yes, Winkle-Yes Scofield-Yes, Horn-Yes, and Langer-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

TECHNICAL PANEL MEMBERSHIP - RECOMMENDATION TO THE NITC*

Rick Golden, Alternate for Walter Weir on the Technical Panel is retiring. Mr. Weir nominated Donald Mihulka, Associate Chief Information Officer for the University of Nebraska. Mr. Mihulka is currently with the University of Nebraska-Computing Services Network and has been with the University of Nebraska for over 30 years**.**

Ms. Horn moved to recommend approval of Donald Mihulka as Walter Weir's alternate on the Technical Panel. Mr. Langer seconded. Roll call vote: Langer-Yes, Horn-Yes, Scofield-Yes, Winkle-Yes, and Weir-Yes. Results: Yes-5, No-0, Abstained-0. Motion carried.

WORK GROUP UPDATES AND OTHER BUSINESS

There were no work group updates.

ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on Tuesday, April 8, 2014 at Varner Hall, 3835 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, Nebraska.

With no further business, Mr. Weir adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

The meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO/NITC.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project: **LINK – Procurement**			Contact: **Bo Botelho**			
Start Date	01/14/2013	Orig. Completion Date	10/31/2013	Revised Completion Date		~~01/06/2014~~
	May	March	February	November	September	Pending July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

Workday Procurement standardizes business processes for procurement documents. Workday Procurement will be the data entry location for all procurement documents (requisitions, purchase orders and contracts). Approvals and printing of the documents will be processed in Workday. Selected supplier websites will be available for access to state contracted pricing through punch-out capability. Purchase Orders will be interfaced in to the State's financial system for encumbering, receipts, and accounts payable. Suppliers will be available for selection in Workday and their associated commodities and procurement contact information will be maintained within Workday.

Project Estimate: $1,895,800 ($1,160,262.52 has been expended)

Comments

May update:

Revisions to implement software simultaneously to all agencies instead of Administrative Services and DHHS are pending review by Director's Office. Original scope indicated roll-out to all remaining agencies after initial implementation, recommendation from project team during recent phases of implementation support roll-out to all agencies at one-time. New target dates are pending due to potential scope changes. The change order and Project Scope are under review by the Director's Office due to change in Administrative Services and Materiel Division leadership.

Currently in the new P.1 Tenant validating Business Process design and functionality.

March update:

Same update as May.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

None

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project: **Network Nebraska Education**			Contact: **Tom Rolfes**			
Start Date	05/01/2006	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2012		Revised Completion Date	08/01/2014
	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

Network Nebraska-Education is a statewide consortium of over 260 K-12 and higher education entities working together to provide a statewide backbone, commodity Internet, distance education, and other value-added services to its participants. Network Nebraska-Education is managed by the State Office of the CIO partnering with the University of Nebraska Computing Services Network (UNCSN).

Project Estimate: $675,998 ($431,911 has been expended)

Comments

May update:

Looking ahead to 7/1/2014, 14 new K-12 entities in Southeast Nebraska will be routed to Network Nebraska-Education over two new aggregation circuits, to ESU 6 (Milford) and a second aggregation circuit to ESU 5 (Beatrice). Backbone bandwidth capacity will be purchased at 2Gbps on all main transport segments as per the current contract with NebraskaLink, but burstable to 5Gbps through the life of the backbone contract, 6/30/2016. UNCSN network engineers have gone live with the Internet2 Commercial Peering Service and are monitoring bandwidth demands. Work is continuing on the roll out of the Intrusion Prevention Services, and a dark fiber project to Grand Island/Kearney. The Network Nebraska Advisory Group (NNAG) and the Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) will be considering the 2014-15 fees at their upcoming meetings. UNL/UNCSN bid commodity Internet during Summer 2013 and the new lower unit rates assisted the State in lowering its Internet costs.

March update:

The project completion date has been extended to August 1, 2014, at which time fourteen (14) new entities are expected to join Network Nebraska-Education.

Looking ahead to 7/1/2014, at least 14 new non-member entities in Southeast Nebraska have confirmed interest in Network Nebraska-Education participation. This would require the Network Nebraska-Education backbone to be extended through an aggregation circuit to ESU 6 (Milford) and a second aggregation circuit to ESU 5 (Beatrice) to maintain parity. Backbone bandwidth capacity will be purchased at 2Gbps on all segments as per the current contract with NebraskaLink, but burstable to 5Gbps through the life of the backbone contract, 6/30/2016. UNCSN network engineers have gone live with the Internet2 Commercial Peering Service and are monitoring bandwidth demands. Work is continuing on the roll out of the Intrusion Prevention Services, and a dark fiber project to Grand Island/Kearney. The Network Nebraska Advisory Group (NNAG) and the Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) will be considering Affiliate Member criteria and fees at their upcoming meetings. The December RFP 4582 had to utilize a Best and Final Offer cycle to broaden the bidding on certain circuits. BAFO Bids opened on Friday, January 31. UNL/UNCSN bid commodity Internet during Summer 2013 and the new lower unit rates assisted the State in lowering its Internet costs.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

As of May 1, 2015, the Network Nebraska-Education Participation Fee fund account has not received UNCSN's 3rd quarter project invoice for expenses through 3/31/2014. Only Equipment Maintenance is running over budget.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project:	**Nebraska Statewide Radio System (formerly Public Safety Wireless)**	Contact:	**Mike Jeffres**

Start Date 06/01/2009 Orig. Completion Date 09/30/2013 Revised Completion Date

	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

The Nebraska Statewide Radio System project is to establish a modern public safety communications system for state agencies. To improve coverage over 95% of the state, superior voice quality, and improved reliability, and to consolidate the state onto a common P25 digital radio standard.

Project Estimate: $11,038,000 ($10,158,000 has been expended)

Comments

May update:
System acceptance and project closeout in process.

March update:
System acceptance and project closeout in process. Motorola is still working to resolve the patrol logging recording issues and the database fixes.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
None

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project:	**Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) – Year 2013-14 (formerly Statewide Online Assessment)**	Contact:	**John Moon**

Start Date	07/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/30/2011	Revised Completion Date	06/30/2014

	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

Legislative Bill 1157 passed by the 2008 Nebraska Legislature required a single statewide assessment of the Nebraska academic content standards for reading, mathematics, science, and writing in Nebraska's K-12 public schools. The new assessment system was named Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA), with NeSA-R for reading assessments, NeSA-M for mathematics, NeSA-S for science, and NeSA-W for writing. The assessments in reading and mathematics were administered in grades 3-8 and 11; science was administered in grades 5, 8, and 11; and writing was administered in grades 4, 8, and 11.

Project Estimate: $5,212,085 ($4,397,652.60 has been expended)

Comments

May update:

The test window for NeSA - Reading, Math, and Science (NeSA-RMS) will close on May 9th. As of May 1, 2014, almost 700,000 NeSA-RMS test have completed online assessment sessions with about 40,000 test sessions per subject per grade. The Nebraska Department of Education assessment office has noted along with Data Recognition Corporation that the frequency of testing issues has decreased last week. On April 17th Data Recognition Corporation delivered student results for writing to the state and respective districts through eDIRECT.

April update:

Data Recognition Corporation provided an enhanced Testing Site Manager version of the software on March 6, 2014 to address issues experienced during NeSA-W assessments. Data Recognition Corporation along with the Nebraska Department of Education investigated the error reports for Testing Site Manager in the Updated INSIGHT engine. Updated INSIGHT software for NeSA-Reading, Math, and Science was then provided to districts on March 21, 2014. The updated software only affected districts using the Testing Site Manager. Data Recognition Corporation assured the Nebraska Department of Education that the update would address issues experienced by districts. An error in printing of test tickets was reported on March 26th and has been resolved.

The Nebraska Department of Education worked with districts concerning technical issues and the viability of the INSIGHT software for the upcoming NeSA-Reading, Math, and Science (NeSA-RMS) window. The NeSA-RMS test window opened on March 24th and by April 1st approximately 18% of the tests (132,091 student tests) were completed. Depending on the grade level, students take either 2 or 3 assessments with 2 sessions scheduled per assessment. The Nebraska Department of Education has added one week to the test window. The last day will be May 9th instead of May 2nd.

The Nebraska Department of Education reached out to several organizations in Nebraska to enhance communication, cooperation, and success of technology for NeSA testing. The Nebraska Department of Education hosted a meeting with the Educational Service Unit – Network Operation Committee and Network Nebraska to facilitate technical support for districts/schools. Data Recognition Corporation has utilized the Network Nebraska staff to test traffic on the system. The Nebraska Department of Education and Data Recognition Corporation have added the Educational Service Unit – Network Operation Committee to NeSA communications. For continuing technology updates, Data Recognition Corporation added a link for Customer Service/Technical Support documents on eDIRECT.

Data Recognition Corporation provided the following schedule for future devices:

- Chromebooks – Fall 2014
- iPads – Fall 2014
- Windows 8.1 Tablets (non-touch) – Fall 2014
- Windows 8.1 Tablets with touch – Spring 2015
- Android – Spring 2015

Additional Comments/Concerns:

Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) is a statewide assessment system mandated by Nebraska Statute. Nebraska Department of Education has contracted with Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) to continue the development of the assessment system including management, development, delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, reporting, and standard setting for the online and pencil/paper reading, science, writing, and mathematics tests for July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. DRC will facilitate the delivery, administration, scanning/imaging, scoring, analysis, and reporting for the alternate pencil/paper reading, science, and mathematics tests during the same assessment window. Online writing assessment will be added to the NeSA system in 2013 for grades 8 and 11.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project:	**Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN)**	Contact:	**Sue Krogman**

Start Date	10/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	06/01/2013	Revised Completion Date		9/30/2015
	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

The Nebraska Regional Interoperability Network (NRIN) is a project that will connect a majority of the Public Safety Access Points (PSAP) across the State by means of a point to point microwave system. The network will be a true, secure means of transferring data, video and voice. Speed and stability are major expectations; therefore there is a required redundant technology base of no less than 100 mbps with 99.999% availability for each site. It is hoped that the network will be used as the main transfer mechanism for currently in-place items, thus imposing a cost-saving to local government. All equipment purchased for this project is compatible with the networking equipment of the OCIO.

Project Estimate: $9,649,675 ($8,175,337.50 has been expended)

Comments

NEMA is struggling with issues of governance and maintenance of the network. Governance would be needed at the local jurisdiction and not at the state agency (there is no state agency is heading the project, it's all run at the local jurisdiction). There is no formal governance heading the project.

May update:
No work is being accomplished due to pending investigation of bidding process.

April update:
Tower assessments have slowed down due to the high volume of request that the contractor has put in. No work can be done on towers without the appropriate mapping report as well as structural analysis. Once the assessment companies can get caught up and the weather holds, we are not foreseeing anymore delays in the project.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
It's possible that upcoming target dates might be missed. Based on the uncertainty of the infrastructure needed for the project and the time involved in obtaining the environmental approvals to proceed with the project, any target dates are fluid. Delays are inevitable due to the difficulty in locating adequate tower sites and negotiating leasing agreements and/or MOU's. As of April 21, 2014 – this contract is on hold pending a State Patrol investigation of the bidding process.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project: **MMIS**				Contact:		
Start Date	N/A	Orig. Completion Date	N/A	Revised Completion Date		N/A
	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						
Comments						

Project On Hold until renewed

Funding has been appropriated for a MMIS replacement in the current biennial budget starting July 1, 2014. Once the project moves forward (a RFP will be developed) DHHS is willing to have it classified as a NITC project.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project: **District Dashboards**				Contact: **Dean Folkers**		
Start Date 07/01/2013	Orig. Completion Date 06/30/2015			Revised Completion Date		
	April	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

Made possible by a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) grant from the United States Department of Education in 2012, the focus of the Nebraska Ed-Fi Dashboard initiative is to provide readily available data to the Nebraska classrooms to facilitate informed decision-making. Potential users include teachers, counselors, and administrators. NDE intends to leverage the Ed-Fi dashboard solution made available by the Michael & Susan Dell Foundation to provide Nebraska with an advanced student performance dashboard system to be customized for Nebraska needs. The Ed-Fi data standard will serve to define the initial data elements powering the Nebraska Ed-Fi dashboard.

Our Plan of Work for design, development, and piloting of the Nebraska Dashboards will commence in three phases, each to proceed subsequently upon successful completion of the previous phase, between the months of September 2013 and December 2014. The phases include: Phase I - Dashboard Readiness (September 2013-February 2014), Phase II – Dashboard Development (February 2014-June 2014), and Phase III – Dashboard Deployment (June 2014-December 2014).

Project Estimate: $466,623.75 has been expended, grant funds only

Comments

April update:

We continue to make progress on the data dashboard initiative. The dashboard pilot school districts have completed their input into customizations of the data dashboard in Nebraska. Likewise, Nebraska Department of Education staff has provided input into said customizations. The look and feel of the dashboard with final revisions and customizations will be revealed at the Nebraska Department of Education – Data Conference April 14-15 in Kearney, NE. Additionally, in cooperation with the Educational Service Unit Coordination Council (ESUCC) and Network Nebraska, the technical hardware is in place to begin development of the dashboard and a sandbox environment is currently being implemented for information system vendors to begin testing. The dashboard pilot project will be leveraging the work being done by the ESUCC relative to development of a single sign on solution via the In Common effort.

March update:

No report for March.

Additional Comments/Concerns:

None

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Project: **EnterpriseOne System Upgrade**				Contact:	**Lacey Pentland**	
Start Date	10/01/2013	Orig. Completion Date	10/03/2014	Revised Completion Date		N/A
	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status						
Schedule						
Budget						
Scope						

Project Description

The State of Nebraska has been using JD Edwards to support the State's agencies for over ten years. The current EnterpriseOne 9.0 system is relatively stable with a medium level of modifications. The program is planned, as much as possible, to be a technical upgrade with minimal impact on the existing business processes, interfaces and the related applications. The current applications landscape is proposed to be upgraded as follows:

- Upgrade from E1 9.0 to E1 9.1 to stay current with the JD Edwards technology stack
- Migrate/Retrofit required customizations to E1 9.1 based on the keep drop analysis
- Be on the latest stack
- Simplification of the existing ecosystem – minimize customization, expand usage of JDE application
- Leverage standard functionalities provided by new features of E1 9.1

Project Estimate: $2,250,000 ($196,249.90 has been expended)

Comments

May update:

Upcoming target dates will be missed due to reduced time available for testing (4 weeks) as a result of CNC (Configurable Network Computing, a resource specific to JD Edwards architecture and methodology) and development delays.

Current work completed:

- Retrofit development continues and about 200+ projects remaining in assigned/pending status
- Functional testing of custom objects almost completed and testing focus to move to retrofit and remaining standard objects
- Webserver and F5 in progress as per plan - to start with 2nd Web server installation
- Webserver and F5 - Weblogic installation undertaken on one webserver and additional to be planned over the next week
- BI Publisher reports being tested in PY (only the pdf)
- Governance meeting undertaken on 4/22 - mitigation plan for FA/CAMS/UPK resource based on one week a month travel being planned out
- Expense Management – Functional Design Documents completed and development in progress

Next Steps:

- Development progress is a challenge and will estimate revised completion date
- Functional Master test plan document to be updated with the objects unit tested to arrive at a parameter to track its completion
- UPK timeline to be reviewed and to schedule Kavitha's time based on it
- Review unit testing timeline given the number of objects pending for retrofit development/dev. lead review status
- ESU process to be finalized, primarily to be driven by the functional team (during the testing phase)
- CNC tasks - F5 and Radview progress to be reviewed. CNC support to be planned based on dcLINK upgrade
- Review feedback about the Wipro resource onsite travel plan

March update:

CNC (Configurable Network Computing, a resource specific to JD Edwards architecture and methodology) work is behind and project may be delayed unless significant progress is made in the next few weeks. Wipro has brought in additional

resources to get caught up in this area.

Current work completed:

- Development team continues to work in E9.1 DEV environment and surface test the retrofit object, about 35%
- completed as of EOD 2/27
- Functional team spent most of the week undertaking data validation of PY environment and no major issues found.
- Testing process review and test plan document being finalized - to be reviewed with the core team next week
- in preparation for configuration and testing phase
- Use of Clarity for Issue tracking finalized and a training session for Wipro folks to be undertaken next week
- Mapping of Test plan with Dev Tracker to be analyzed and to prioritize the testing of the more complex retrofit objects
- A dedicated development resource - Muneeb Ahmad assigned to Expense Management team
- Review of CNC resource plan and plan for onboarding of new CNC resources.

Next Steps:

- Development team to continue with the surface testing of the assigned objects and review the % completion for the next milestone target
- Review the test plan with the Core team and then start with the configuration and testing in PY
- Continue to work on the pending issues for E9.1 Dev - BI Publisher integration,F5 and update the CNC related documents
- Set up of Clarity for the core team and undertake a session to walk-thru the use of the tool.
- CNC resource plan - to start onboarding of new resources and plan out their activities
- FA/CAM testing support plan - resource confirmation and time period
- An additional development resource -Vidhya will be inducted in the team - to plan for her onboarding

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

The project(s) listed below are reporting voluntarily and is not considered as an Enterprise Project by the NITC.

Project:	**NeSIS PeopleSoft Campus Solutions ADA Compliance**	Contact:	**Jim Zemke**

Start Date	08/01/2010	Orig. Completion Date	12/31/2011	Revised Completion Date	09/01/2014

	May	March	February	November	September	July
Overall Status	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Gray	Yellow	Gray
Schedule	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Gray	Yellow	Gray
Budget	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Gray	Red	Gray
Scope	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Gray	Red	Gray

Project Description
Requested

Project Estimate: TBD

Comments

May update:
University of Nebraska is in the process of replacing the Oracle supplied Campus Solutions portal application with an in-house developed dashboard application that is being developed in accordance with these compliance standards. This dashboard application, which includes separate dashboards for faculty, students, and advisors, will be implemented for the University of Nebraska system campuses over the course of the next few months and for the state colleges for the fall term. Inclusion of these new compliance standards has added some development time to this effort but we believe the added time and effort is justified.

The University has hired a visually impaired student who will assist us in our ADA testing efforts. This student will start work the week of May 12th. This student has experience working with screen readers and other assistive technologies and will be able to provide real-world, hands-on testing and evaluation capability.

March update:
Work continues to clearly define University of Nebraska's institutional position concerning "reasonable accommodation". We have completed an initial evaluation of the current ADA compliance level of our Campus Solutions system. The results of this evaluation have been forwarded on to Oracle. They responded indicating they feel Campus Solutions is appropriately compliant. We have developed a strategy and plan to address compliance issues for in house developed Campus Solutions related application development. Additional staff has been added to the NeSIS project team to assist with compliance related activities. We have reviewed the additional applications related to Campus Solutions processing (e.g. the campus SIS portals, the Online Admissions application, etc.) that we have implemented and we are working to make sure these applications comply with our ADA compliance standards.

Additional Comments/Concerns:
The vendor has certified the Campus Solutions student information system was ADA compliant. However, subsequent analysis indicates that some accessibility issues do exist and the level of compliance provided may not be adequate. Also, additional functionality beyond that included in the base Campus Solutions system has also been implemented and those functional components will also have to be evaluated.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Enterprise Project Status Dashboard – as of May, 2014

Color Legend		
	Red	**Project has significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Current status requires immediate escalation and management involvement.** Probable that item will **NOT** meet dates with acceptable quality without changes to schedule, resources, and/or scope.
	Yellow	**Project has a current or potential risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** **Project Manager will manage risks based on risk mitigation planning.** Good probability item will meet dates and acceptable quality. Schedule, resource, or scope changes may be needed.
	Green	**Project has no significant risk to baseline cost, schedule, or project deliverables.** Strong probability project will meet dates and acceptable quality.
	Gray	**No report for the reporting period or the project has not yet been activated.**

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

NITC 3-203: Elevation Acquisition using LiDAR Standards

Notes:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC").
2. If you have comments on this document, you may submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on June 4, 2014.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for June 10, 2014. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.nebraska.gov/technical_panel/meetings/index.html.

NITC 3-203
Elevation Acquisition using LiDAR Standards

review version 6
(date 4.18.2014)

Category: Data and Information Architecture
Applicability: See Each Section of Standards
History: Adopted on [Month Day, Year]

NITC | Nebraska Information Technology Commission
GIS Council

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION GIS COUNCIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Standards

These standards are intended for entities participating in collaborative efforts to acquire airborne LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) elevations that may contribute to a comprehensive statewide elevation dataset in Nebraska The standards provide a consistent structure for data producers and users to ensure compatibility of datasets within the same framework layer and among other framework layers.

1.1 Federal Connection

At the national level, the 3D Elevation Program (3DEP) initiative is being developed to respond to growing needs for high-quality topographic data and for a wide range of other three-dimensional representations of the Nation's natural and constructed features. The primary goal of 3DEP is to systematically collect enhanced elevation data in the form of high-quality LiDAR data over the conterminous United States, Hawaii, and the U.S. territories, with data acquired over an 8-year period.

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Geospatial Program's (NGP) has published LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0 to create consistency across NGP and partner funded LiDAR collections. The intent of Nebraska's standards is also to facilitate participation in collaborative efforts to acquire airborne LiDAR elevations and thus the LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0 is adopted as the basis of the standards, guidelines, and recommendations in this document. The following Technical and Operation section provides additional detail to the Base Specification where Nebraska's requirements depart from the specifications in the document or where additional clarity is necessary. All such standards/guidelines, not specifically addressed in the body of this document are subject to the specifications in the LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0.

1.2 Technical and Operation

The following standards are intended to provide additional detail specifically related to LiDAR projects in Nebraska:

1.2.1 Collection

1.2.1.1 Nominal Point Spacing (NPS)

a) Required: An NPS of 1.4 meters or less
b) Recommended: An NPS of 0.7 meters

1.2.1.2 Vertical Accuracy

a) Required: Fundamental Vertical Accuracy <= 24.5 centimeters (cm) AccuracyZ(Acc_z), 95 percent (12.5 cm Root Mean Square Error ($RMSE)_z$) for LiDAR acquired at a NPS greater than one meter.
b) Required: Fundamental Vertical Accuracy <= 18.2 centimeters (cm) AccuracyZ(Acc_z), 95 percent (9.25 cm Root Mean Square Error ($RMSE)_z$) for LiDAR acquired at a NPS of 1.0 meters or less.

1.2.1.3 Data Processing and Handling

a) Recommended: Coordinate Reference System - Nebraska State Plane, NAD83 HARN, U.S. feet, NAVD88, U.S. feet.
b) Optional: Hydro-Flattening – Optional (USGS required).

c) Optional: Hydro-Enforced – The state of Nebraska recommends collection of breaklines for the development of a *Hydro-enforced*, Bare-earth Digital Elevation Model (DEM).

1.2.1.4 Deliverables—In addition to the raw and classified point cloud and the metadata, deliverables will include:

a) Required: Bare-Earth DEM
   i. Cell size 2 meters for LiDAR acquired at greater than 1.0 meter NPS
   ii. Cell size 1 meter for LiDAR acquired at 1.0 meter or less NPS
b) Recommended: Hydro-Enforced, Bare-Earth DEM
   i. Cell size 2 meters for LiDAR acquired at greater than 1.0 meter NPS
   ii. Cell size 1 meter for LiDAR acquired at 1.0 meter or less NPS
   iii. Breaklines used for Hydro-Enforcement (required if hydro-enforced)

2.0 **Purpose and Objectives**

2.1 Purpose

The primary purpose of these standards/guidelines is to realize the maximum long-term benefit of elevation data acquisitions, and in doing so, help protect the public's investment in Nebraska's geospatial infrastructure. These standards will help ensure that elevation data acquisitions are current, consistent, accurate, high-resolution, accessible, and cost-effective.

Background

Elevation data is foundational to the development of the Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI). First, it is required for the rectification of imagery which is the foundation for most of the other geospatial data layers in the NESDI and is a valuable base map in its own right. The accuracy of infrastructure data layers, in part, determines the extent to which they can be integrated and ultimately their suitability to support the greatest range of applications. Additionally, many projects and programs in Nebraska require up-to-date, accurate and consistent elevation data.

LiDAR has been collected for approximately 59% of the state on a project by project basis. Applications that require high-quality elevation data have been limited in that the data is not always consistent across project boundaries, and the fact that LiDAR elevations are not available for the whole state, thus falling short of the maximum return on investment. A statewide elevation dataset would provide instantaneous access to accurate elevation data, reducing costs and time required to merge together projects, or worse, to acquire missing data via less cost-effective methods. A sample of applications that rely on high quality elevation data in Nebraska include:

2.1.1 Hydrology and hydraulics
   a) Base Flood Elevation (BFE) determinations
   b) Floodplain and flood inundation mapping
   c) Dam breach analysis and hazard potential classification

2.1.2 Engineering design and design reviews
   a) Bridge and roadway design
   b) Siting of transmission lines, power lines, cell towers, pipelines
   c) Flood control structures
   d) Conservation structures

2.1.3 Emergency Management

2.1.3.1 The Hazards U.S. Multi-Hazard (HAZUS-MH) estimates of potential dollars lost during flood disasters

2.1.4 Natural resources applications
- 2.1.4.1 Sediment erosion and transport
- 2.1.4.2 Watershed delineation and flow analyses
- 2.1.4.3 Suitability analyses for plants, animals and other species

2.1.5 Conservation planning
- 2.1.5.1 Modeling of landforms, habitat, vegetation, etc.
- 2.1.5.2 Channel topography
- 2.1.5.3 Vegetation and land cover studies
- 2.1.5.4 Precision agriculture

2.1.6 Cartographic applications
- 2.1.6.1 Soil survey
- 2.1.6.2 Imagery rectification
- 2.1.6.3 Building and other structural footprints

2.1.7 Fire Modeling
- 2.1.7.1 Vegetative density and their placement in the landscape

2.2 Objectives

These standards and guidelines to guide the acquisition and development of LiDAR data in Nebraska have the following objectives.

2.2.1 Provide guidance to state and local officials as they work, either in-house or with private contractors, to develop and/or acquire LiDAR elevation data and thereby increase the likelihood that the data acquired and/or developed will be suitable for the range of intended applications and likely future applications. The maintenance of elevation data is necessary for the data to be current and accurate. The requirements of maintenance involving stewardship and reporting of errors and handling updates is located in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Elevation Business Plan. These plans are currently in draft and are forthcoming.

2.2.2 Improve public policy development and implementation by helping to make elevation data more current and readily accessible.

2.2.3 Enhance coordination and program management across jurisdictional boundaries by insuring that elevation data can be horizontally integrated across jurisdictional and/or project boundaries for regional or statewide applications.

2.2.4 Save public resources by facilitating the sharing of elevation data among public agencies or sub-divisions of agencies by incorporating data standards and following guidelines which will make it more likely that the elevation data developed by one entity will also be suitable to serve the multiple needs of other entities and thereby avoid the costly duplication of developing and maintaining similar elevation data.

2.2.5 Make elevation data more readily accessible to the wide range of potential users. The statewide elevation layer will be distributed according to requirements identified in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Elevation Business Plan.

2.2.6 Facilitate harmonious, trans-agency public policy decision-making and implementation by enabling multiple agencies and levels of government to access and appropriately use common geospatial datasets and thereby make it more likely that intersecting public policy decisions, across levels of government, will be based on the same information.

2.2.7 Lay the foundation for facilitating intergovernmental partnerships for the acquisition and development of high-quality elevation data by defining standards and guidelines that increase the likelihood that the elevation data will meet the needs of multiple users.

3.0 Definitions

Refer to the LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0 glossary for a more complete set of definitions.

3.1 $Accuracy_z$ (ACCz) (Vertical Accuracy) - The NSSDA reporting standard in the vertical component that equals the linear uncertainty value, such that the true or theoretical vertical location of the point falls within that linear uncertainty value 95 percent of the time. ACCz = 1.9600x RMSEz.

3.2 Bare earth - Digital elevation data of the terrain, free from vegetation, buildings and other man-made structures. Elevations of the ground.

3.3 Breakline - linear feature that describes a change in the smoothness or continuity of a surface.

3.4 Contour - Lines of equal elevation on a surface. An imaginary line on the ground, all points of which are at the same elevation above or below a specified vertical datum. (FEMA's Definition)

3.5 Digital Elevation Model (DEM) - the digital cartographic representation of the elevation of the land at regularly spaced intervals in x and y directions, using z-values referenced to a common vertical datum.

3.6 Digital Surface Model (DSM) - Similar to Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) or digital terrain models (DTMs), except that they may depict the elevations of the top surfaces of buildings, trees, towers, and other features elevated above the bare earth.

3.7 Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) - The value by which vertical accuracy of LiDAR can be equitably assessed and compared among datasets. The fundamental vertical accuracy of a dataset must be determined with well-distributed checkpoints located only in open terrain, free of vegetation, where there is a high probability that the sensor will have detected the ground surface. It is obtained using standard tests for Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), where FVA = ACCz = RMSEz x 1.9600.

3.8 Hydrologically-conditioned (hydro-conditioned) - Processing of a DEM or Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN) so that the flow of water is continuous across the entire terrain surface, including the removal of all spurious sinks or pits.

3.9 Hydrologically-enforced (hydro-enforced) - Processing of water bodies so that lakes and reservoirs are level and streams flow downhill. For example, a DEM, TIN or topographic contour dataset with elevations removed from the tops of selected drainage structures (bridges and culverts) so as to depict the terrain under those structures. Hydro-enforcement enables hydrologic and hydraulic models to depict water flowing under these structures, rather than appearing in the computer model to be dammed by them because of road deck elevations higher than the water levels. Hydro-enforced TINs also use breaklines along shorelines and stream centerlines. An example of this is where breaklines form the edges of TIN triangles along the alignment of drainage features. Shore breaklines for streams would be 3-D breaklines with elevations that decrease as the stream flows downstream; however, shore breaklines for lakes or reservoirs would have the same elevation for the entire shoreline if the water surface is known or assumed to be level throughout.

3.10 Hydrologically-flattened (hydro-flattened) - Processing of a LiDAR-derived surface DEM or TIN Model so that mapped water bodies, rivers, reservoirs, and other cartographically polygonal water surfaces are flat, and where appropriate, level from bank-to-bank.

3.11 LiDAR - An instrument that measures distance to a reflecting object by emitting timed pulses of light and measuring the time difference between the emission of a laser pulse and the reception of the pulse's reflection(s). The measured time interval for each reflection is converted to distance, which when combined with position and attitude information from Global Positioning System (GPS), Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU), and the instrument itself, allows the derivation of the 3-dimensional point location of the reflecting target's location.

3.12 Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure

3.13 Nominal Point Spacing (NPS) - A common measure of the density of a LiDAR dataset, it is the typical or average lateral distance between points in a LiDAR dataset, most often expressed in meters. Often it is simply calculated as the square root of the average area per point. This value is predicted in mission planning and empirically calculated from the collected data. In high-density collections (<1 meter NPS), this may be directly expressed as Points per Square Meter (PPSM). PPSM = $1/NPS^2$.

3.14 Points – In the context for elevation, points are geospatial objects that represent spot elevations of randomly intersected features. Attributes are X, Y, and Z coordinates at a minimum, but may also include pulse number, return number, intensity, flight line number, scan angle, GPS time and feature class.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

State agencies that are involved in the acquisition of elevation data are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

4.2 State Funded Entities

Entities that are not state agencies but receive direct or indirect state funding for acquisition of elevation data are also required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

4.3 Other

Other entities, such as local government agencies (e.g. County Offices, Natural Resources Districts, municipalities) involved in the acquisition of elevation data are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

4.4 Waivers

Waivers to these standards may be granted by the NITC Technical Panel upon request by an agency. See the NITC Waiver Policy 1-103 for more details.

5.0 Responsibility

5.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)

5.2 Granting Agencies and Entities

State granting or fund disbursement entities or agencies will be responsible for ensuring that these standards are included in requirements and regulations related to fund disbursements as they relate to LiDAR acquisition.

5.3 Other

Local government agencies will be responsible for ensuring that these standards are included in requirements and regulations related to fund disbursements as they relate to LiDAR acquisition.

6.0 Authority

6.1 NITC GIS Council

According to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-572(2), the GIS Council shall: Establish guidelines and policies for statewide Geographic Information Systems operations and management (a) The acquisition, development, maintenance, quality assurance such as standards, access, ownership, cost recovery, and priorities of data bases; (b) The compatibility, acquisition, and communications of hardware and software; (c) The assessment of needs, identification of scope, setting of standards, and determination of an appropriate enforcement mechanism; (d) The fostering of training programs and promoting education and information about the Geographic Information Systems; and (e) The promoting of the Geographic Information Systems development in the State of Nebraska and providing or coordinating additional support to address Geographic Information Systems issues as such issues arise.

7.0 Related Documents

These standards are related to and based on NGP's LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0: http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/11b4/

8.0 Appendices

8.1 Nebraska LiDAR Base Specifications

The following is an adaptation of the LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0 specific to Nebraska LiDAR acquisitions. Specific differences between the LiDAR Base Specification Version 1.0 and Nebraska specifications include:

Collection

- Nebraska requires a NPS of 1.4 meters or less.
- Nebraska projects typically collect LiDAR points at 1 of 2 Nominal Point Spacings, 0.7 and 1.4 meters. Each has specific accuracy requirements.

Data Processing and Handling

- Preferred CRS is Nebraska State Plane, NAD83, Feet, NAVD88, Feet
- Nebraska does not require Hydro-Flattening of DEMs

Deliverables

- Recommends 2 DEMs,
    - Bare-Earth topographic DEM (Required. Hydro-flattening not required)
    - Bare-Earth Hydro-conditioned DEM (Optional)

Collection

Multiple Discrete Returns
Data collection must be capable of at least three returns per pulse. Full waveform collection is acceptable.

Intensity Values
Intensity values are required for each return. The values are to be recorded in the .las files in their native radiometric resolution.

Nominal Pulse Spacing (NPS)
An NPS of **1.4** meters or less is required. Assessment of the NPS will be made against single swath, first-return only data, located within the geometrically usable center portion (typically 90 percent) of each swath, acceptable data voids excluded. NPS will be calculated as the square root of the average area per point. Average along-track and cross-track point spacing should be comparable (within 10 percent).
In general, the target NPS for a project should not be achieved through swath overlap or multiple passes. Such collection techniques may be permitted with prior approval.

Data Voids
Data voids within a single swath are not acceptable, except in the following circumstances:

- Where caused by water bodies,
- Where caused by areas of low near infra-red (NIR) reflectivity such as asphalt or composition roofing, or
- Where appropriately filled-in by another swath.

Spatial Distribution
The spatial distribution of geometrically usable points is expected to be uniform. Although it is understood that LiDAR instruments do not produce regularly gridded points, collections should be planned and executed to produce a first-return point cloud that approaches a regular lattice of points, rather than a collection of widely spaced high density profiles of the terrain. The uniformity of the point density throughout the dataset is important and will be assessed using the following steps:

- Generating a density grid from the data with cell sizes equal to the design NPS times 2, using a radius equal to the design NPS.

- Ensuring at least 90 percent of the cells in the grid contain at least one LiDAR point.
- The assessment is to be made against individual (single) swaths, using only the first-return points located within the geometrically usable center portion (typically 90 percent) of each swath.
- Excluding acceptable data voids previously identified in this specification.

  Note: This requirement may be relaxed in areas of substantial relief where it is impractical to maintain a consistent and uniform distribution.
  Note: The process described in this section relates only to the uniformity of the point distribution. It in no way relates to, nor can it be used for the assessment of point density or NPS.

Scan Angle
Scan angle will support horizontal and vertical accuracy within the requirements as specified in the next two sections. Note: This requirement primarily is applicable to oscillating mirror LiDAR systems. Other instrument technologies may be exempt from this requirement.

Vertical Accuracy
Vertical accuracy of the LiDAR data will be assessed and reported in accordance with the guidelines developed by the National Digital Elevation Program (NDEP) and subsequently adopted by the American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing (ASPRS). Complete definitions for vertical accuracy assessments are in Section 1.5 of the NDEP Elevation Guidelines (NDEP, 2004). The minimum vertical accuracy requirement for the unclassified LiDAR point cloud, using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology, is listed below:

- Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) <= 24.5 centimeters (cm) Accuracyz (ACCz), 95 percent (12.5 cm Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)z).
- The minimum vertical accuracy requirements for the derived DEM, using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology are listed below:
- Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) <= 24.5 cm ACCz, 95 percent (12.5cm RMSEz);
- Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) <= 36.3cm, 95th percentile, and
- Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) <= 36.3 cm, 95th percentile.
- The minimum vertical accuracy requirement for the unclassified LiDAR point cloud for LIDAR collected at 0,7 m NPS, using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology, is listed below:
- Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) <= 18.5 centimeters (cm) Accuracyz (ACCz), 95 percent (9.25 cm Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)z).
- The minimum vertical accuracy requirements for the derived DEM, using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology are listed below:
- Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (FVA) <= 18.5 cm ACCz, 95 percent (9.255cm RMSEz);
- Consolidated Vertical Accuracy (CVA) <= 27.7 cm, 95th percentile, and
- Supplemental Vertical Accuracy (SVA) <= 27.7 cm, 95th percentile**.**

Point cloud data accuracy is to be tested against a Triangulated Irregular Network (TIN) constructed from LiDAR points in clear and open areas. A clear and open area can be characterized with respect to topographic and ground cover variation such that a minimum of 5 times the NPS exists with less than 1/3 of the RMSEz deviation from a low-slope plane. Slopes that exceed 10 percent should be avoided. Ground that has been plowed or otherwise disturbed is not acceptable. All tested locations should be photographed showing the position of the tripod and the surrounding area ground condition.

Each land cover type representing 10 percent or more of the total project area must be tested and reported with an SVA.

In areas where a land cover category is something other than forested or dense urban, the tested point should not have any obstructions 45 degrees above the horizon to ensure a sufficient TIN surface. Additionally, tested areas should not be in proximity to low NIR reflective surfaces such as asphalt or composition roofing materials.

The SVA value is provided as a target. It is understood that in areas of dense vegetation, swamps, or extremely difficult terrain, this value may be exceeded.

The CVA value is a requirement that must be met, regardless of any allowed “busts” in the SVA(s) for individual land cover types within the project.

Checkpoints for each assessment (FVA, CVA, and all SVAs) are required to be well-distributed throughout the land cover type, for the entire project area. See Glossary for definition of well-distributed.

Exceptions: These requirements may be relaxed in cases:

- Where there exists a demonstrable and substantial increase in cost to obtain this accuracy.
- Where an alternate specification is needed to conform to previously contracted phases of a single larger overall collection effort, for example, multi-year statewide collections.
- Where the USGS agrees that it is reasonable and in the best interest of all stakeholders to use an alternate specification.

Relative Accuracy

The requirements for relative accuracy are listed below:

- Within individual swaths: <= 7 cm RMSEz
- Within overlap between adjacent swaths: <=10 cm RMSEz

Flightline Overlap

Flightline overlap of 10 percent or greater is required to ensure there are no data gaps between the usable portions of the swaths. Collections in high relief terrain are expected to require greater overlap. Any data with gaps between the geometrically usable portions of the swaths will be rejected.

Collection Area

- Data collection for the Defined Project Area, buffered by a minimum of 100 meters, is required. The buffered boundary is the Buffered Project Area.
- In order that all products are consistent to the edge of the Defined Project Area, all products must be generated to the limit of the Buffered Project Area. Since these areas are being generated, they shall also be delivered.

Collection Conditions

- Atmospheric conditions must be cloud and fog-free between the aircraft and ground during all collection operations.
- Ground conditions must be snow free. Very light, undrifted snow may be acceptable in special cases, with prior approval.
- Water conditions must be free of any unusual flooding or inundation, except in cases where the goal of the collection is to map the inundation.
- Leaf-off vegetation conditions are preferred, however, as numerous factors beyond human control may affect the vegetative condition at the time of any collection, the USGS NGP only requires that penetration to the ground must be adequate to produce an accurate and reliable bare-earth surface suitable for incorporation into the 1/9 (3-meter) NED. Collections for specific scientific research projects may be exempted from this requirement, with prior approval.

Data Processing and Handling

ASPRS LAS File Format

All processing should be carried out with the understanding that all point deliverables are required to be in fully compliant LAS format, either v1.2 or v1.3. The version selected must be used for all LAS deliverables in the project. Data producers are encouraged to review the LAS specification in detail (ASPRS, 2011).

Full Waveform
If full waveform data are collected, delivery of the waveform packets is required. LAS v1.3 deliverables with waveform data are to use external auxiliary files with the extension .wdp for the storage of waveform packet data. See the LAS v1.3 Specification for additional information (ASPRS, 2011).

Global Positioning System (GPS) Times
GPS times are to be recorded as Adjusted GPS Time, at a precision sufficient to allow unique timestamps for each pulse.
Adjusted GPS Time is defined to be Standard (or satellite) GPS time minus 1*109. See the LAS v1.3 Specification for more detail (ASPRS, 2011).

Datums
All data collected must be tied to the datums listed below:

- Horizontal datum reference to the North American Datum of 1983/HARN adjustment (NAD83 HARN) is required.
- Vertical datum reference to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) is required.
- The most recent National Geodetic Survey (NGS)-approved geoid model is required to perform conversions from ellipsoidal heights to orthometric heights.

Coordinate Reference System

- The Nebraska preferred Coordinate Reference System for projects conducted within the state is Nebraska State Plane, NAD83 HARN, Feet; NAVD88, Feet.
- The USGS preferred Coordinate Reference System for the Conterminous United States (CONUS) is Universal Transverse Mercator UTM, NAD83 HARN, Meters; NAVD88, Meters and this Coordinate Reference System may be used. Each discrete project is to be processed using the single predominant UTM zone for the overall collection area.

Units of Reference
All references to the unit of measure “Feet” and “Foot” must specify “International”, “Intl”, “U.S. Survey”, or “US”.

Swath Identification
Each swath will be assigned a unique File Source ID. It is required that the Point Source ID field for each point within each LAS swath file be set equal to the File Source ID before any processing of the data. See the LAS v1.3 Specification (ASPRS, 2011).

Point Families
Point families (multiple return “children” of a single “parent” pulse) shall be maintained intact through all processing before tiling. Multiple returns from a given pulse will be stored in sequential (collected) order.

Swath Size and Segmentation
Swath files will be 2 gigabytes (GB) in size or less. Long swaths (those which result in a LAS file larger than 2 GB) will be split into segments no greater than 2 GB each.

- Each sub-swath will retain the original File Source ID of the original complete swath.
- Points within each sub-swath will retain the Point Source ID of the original complete swath.
- Each sub-swath file will be named identically to the original complete swath, with the addition of an ordered alphabetic suffix to the name (“-a”, “-b” … “-n”). The order of the named sub-swaths shall be consistent with the collection order of the points (“-a” will be the chronological beginning of the swath; “-n” will be the chronological end of the swath).
- Point families shall be maintained intact within each sub-swath.
- Sub-swaths should be broken at the edge of the scan line.
- Other swath segmentation approaches may be acceptable, with prior approval.

Scope of Collection

- All collected swaths are to be delivered as part of the Raw Data Deliverable. This includes calibration swaths and crossties.
- This in no way requires or implies that calibration swath data are to be included in product generation. All collected points are to be delivered. No points are to be deleted from the swath LAS files. Excepted from this are extraneous data outside of the buffered project area (aircraft turns, transit between the collection area and airport, transit between fill-in areas, and the like).
- These points may be permanently removed. Busted swaths that are being completely discarded by the vendor and re-flown do not need to be delivered.

Use of the LAS Withheld Flag

- Outliers, blunders, noise points, geometrically unreliable points near the extreme edge of the swath, and other points the vendor deems unusable are to be identified using the Withheld flag, as defined in the LAS specification.
- This applies primarily to points that are identified during pre-processing or through automated post-processing routines.
- If processing software is not capable of populating the Withheld bit, these points may be identified using Class=11.
- Noise points subsequently identified during manual Classification and Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) may be assigned the standard LAS classification value for Noise (Class=7), regardless of whether the noise is “low” or “high” relative to the ground surface.

Point Classification

- ALL points not identified as Withheld are to be classified.
- No points in the Classified LAS deliverable will be assigned Class=0.
- Use of the ASPRS/LAS Overlap classification (Class=12) is prohibited.
- If overlap points are required to be differentiated by the data producer or cooperating partner, they must be identified using a method that does not interfere with their classification:
- Overlap points are tagged using Bit:0 of the User Data byte, as defined in the LAS specification. (SET=Overlap).
- Overlap points are classified using the Standard Class values + 16.
- Other techniques as agreed upon in advance.

The technique used to identify overlap must be clearly described in the project metadata files.
Note: A standard bit flag for identification of overlap points has been included in LAS v1.4, released on November 14, 2011.

Positional Accuracy Validation

Before classification of and development of derivative products from the point cloud, verification of the vertical accuracy of the point cloud, absolute and relative, is required. The Fundamental Vertical Accuracy (absolute) is to be assessed in clear, open areas as described in the section called Vertical Accuracy above. Swath-to-swath and within swath accuracies (relative) are to be documented. A detailed report of this validation process is a required deliverable.

Classification Accuracy

It is required that due diligence in the classification process will produce data that meet the following tests:

- Following classification processing, no non-withheld points should remain in Class 0.
- Within any 1 kilometer (km) x 1 km area, no more than 2 percent of non-withheld points will possess a demonstrably erroneous classification value.
- Points remaining in Class 1 that should be classified in any other required Class are subject to these accuracy requirements and will be counted towards the 2 percent threshold.

Note: These requirements may be relaxed to accommodate collections in areas where the USGS agrees classification to be particularly difficult.

Classification Consistency
Point classification is to be consistent across the entire project. Noticeable variations in the character, texture, or quality of the classification between tiles, swaths, lifts, or other non-natural divisions will be cause for rejection of the entire deliverable.

Tiles
Note: This section assumes a projected coordinate reference system.
A single non-overlapped tiling scheme (the Project Tiling Scheme) will be established and agreed upon by the data producer and the USGS before collection. This scheme will be used for ALL tiled deliverables.

- Tile size is required to be an integer multiple of the cell size of raster deliverables.
- Tiles are required to be sized using the same units as the coordinate system of the data.
- Tiles are required to be indexed in X and Y to an integer multiple of the tile's X-Y dimensions.
- All tiled deliverables will conform to the Project Tiling Scheme, without added overlap.
- Tiled deliverables will edge-match seamlessly and without gaps.

Hydro-Enforcement
Processing of mapped water bodies so that streams flow downhill. Specifically, Nebraska Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) are derived with elevations removed from the tops of selected drainage structures (bridges and culverts) so as to depict the terrain under those structures. Hydro-enforcement enables hydrologic and hydraulic models to depict water flowing under these structures, rather than appearing in the computer model to be dammed by them because of road deck elevations higher than the water levels.

Hydro-Flattening
***Note: Hydro-Flattening is not required for any known Nebraska application and imposes a significant increase in costs. This section applies only to LiDAR acquisitions in which USGS participation covers this cost increase in its entirety.**
Hydro-flattening pertains only to the creation of derived DEMs. No manipulation of or changes to originally computed LiDAR point elevations are to be made. Breaklines may be used to help classify the point data. The goal of the NGP is for the delivered DEMs to represent water bodies in a cartographically and aesthetically pleasing manner. It is not the goal of the NGP to accurately map water surface elevations within the NED. The requirements for hydro-flattening are listed below.

Inland Ponds and Lakes

- 2 acres or greater surface area (approximately equal to a round pond 350 feet in diameter) at the time of collection.
- Flat and level water bodies (single elevation for every bank vertex defining a given water body).
- The entire water surface edge must be at or below the immediately surrounding terrain. The presence of floating water bodies will be cause for rejection of the deliverable.
- Long impoundments such as reservoirs, inlets, and fjords, whose water surface elevations drop when moving downstream, are required to be treated as rivers.

Inland Streams and Rivers

- 100 feet nominal width: This should not unnecessarily break a stream or river into multiple segments. At times it may squeeze slightly below 100 feet for short segments. Data producers should use their best professional cartographic judgment.
- Flat and level bank-to-bank (perpendicular to the apparent flow centerline); gradient to follow the immediately surrounding terrain. In cases of sharp turns of rapidly moving water, where the natural water surface is notably not level bank- to- bank, it is appropriate to represent the water surface as it exists in nature, while maintaining an aesthetic cartographic appearance.
- The entire water surface edge must be at or below the immediately surrounding terrain.
- Stream channels are required to break at road crossings (culvert locations). The roadway over a culvert should be continuous.

- A culvert, regardless of size, is defined as having earth between the road surface and the top of the structure.
- Bridges are required to be removed from the DEM. Streams and rivers should be continuous at bridge locations. Bridges are defined as having an elevated deck structure that does not rest on earth.
- When the identification of a structure such as a bridge or culvert cannot be made reliably, the feature should be regarded as a culvert.

Non-Tidal Boundary Waters

- Represented only as an edge or edges within the project area; collection does not include the opposing shore.
- Water surface is to be flat and level, as appropriate for the type of water body (level for lakes; gradient for rivers)
- The entire water surface edge must be at or below the immediately surrounding terrain.

Tidal Waters

- Tidal water bodies are defined as water bodies such as oceans, seas, gulfs, bays, inlets, salt marshes, large lakes, and the like. This includes any water body that is affected by tidal variations.
- Tidal variations over the course of a collection or between different collections will result in lateral and vertical discontinuities along shorelines. This is considered normal and these anomalies should be retained. The final DEM is required to represent as much ground as the collected data permits.
- Water surface is to be flat and level, to the degree allowed by the irregularities noted above.
- Scientific research projects in coastal areas often have specific requirements with regard to how tidal land-water boundaries are to be handled. For such projects, the requirements of the research will take precedence.

Islands

- Permanent islands 1 acre or larger shall be delineated within all water bodies.

Single-Line Streams

Cooperating partners may require collection and integration of single-line streams within their LiDAR projects. Although the USGS does not require these breaklines be collected or integrated, it does require that if used and incorporated into the DEMs, the following guidelines are met:

- All vertices along single-line stream breaklines are at or below the immediately surrounding terrain.
- Single-line stream breaklines are not to be used to introduce cuts into the DEM at road crossings (culverts), dams, or other such features. This is hydro-enforcement and as discussed in appendix 3 will create a non-topographic DEM that is unsuitable for integration into the NED.
- All breaklines used to modify the surface are to be delivered to the USGS with the DEMs.

Deliverables

The USGS requires unrestricted rights to all delivered data and reports, which will be placed in the public domain. This specification places no restrictions on the data provider's rights to resell data or derivative products as they see fit.

Metadata

The term "metadata" refers to all descriptive information about the project. This includes textual reports, graphics, supporting shapefiles, and Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC)-compliant metadata files. Metadata deliverables include the following items:

- Collection report detailing mission planning and flight logs.
- Survey report detailing the collection of control and reference points used for calibration and QA/QC.

- Processing report detailing calibration, classification, and product generation procedures including methodology used for breakline collection and hydro-flattening.
- QA/QC Reports (detailing the analysis, accuracy assessment and validation of the following:
- Point data (absolute, within swath, and between swath)
- Bare-earth surface (absolute)
- Other optional deliverables as appropriate
- Control and calibration points: All control and reference points used to calibrate, control, process, and validate the LiDAR point data or any derivative products that are to be delivered.
- Georeferenced, digital spatial representation of the precise extents of each delivered dataset. This should reflect the extents of the actual LiDAR source or derived product data, exclusive of TIN artifacts or raster NODATA areas. A union of tile boundaries or minimum bounding rectangles is not acceptable. ESRI Polygon shapefile or geodatabase is preferred.
- Product metadata [FGDC compliant, eXtensible Markup Language (XML) format metadata]. Metadata files for individual files are not required. One XML file is required for the following examples:
- The Overall Project: Describing the project boundary, the intent of the project, the types of data collected as part of the project, the various deliverables for the project, and other project-wide information.
- Each Lift: Describing the extents of the lift, the swaths included in the lift, locations of GPS base stations and control for the lift, preprocessing and calibration details for the lift, adjustment and fitting processes applied to the lift in relation to other lifts, and other lift-specific information.
- Each tiled deliverable product group:
- Classified point data
- Bare-earth DEMs
- Breaklines (if used)
- Other datasets delivered under the contract (Digital Surface Models (DSM), intensity images, height surfaces, and others)
- FGDC compliant metadata must pass the USGS metadata parser (mp) with no errors.

Raw Point Cloud

Delivery of the raw point cloud is a standard requirement for USGS NGP LiDAR projects. Raw point cloud deliverables include the following items:

- All swaths, returns, and collected points, fully calibrated and adjusted to ground, by swath.
- Fully compliant LAS v1.2 or v1.3, Point Data Record Format 1, 3, 4, or 5.
- LAS v1.3 deliverables with waveform data are to use external auxiliary files with the extension .wdp for the storage of waveform packet data. See the LAS v1.3 Specification for additional information.
- Correct and properly formatted georeference information must be included in all LAS file headers.
- GPS times are to be recorded as Adjusted GPS Time, at a precision sufficient to allow unique timestamps for each pulse.
- Intensity values (native radiometric resolution).
- One file per swath, one swath per file, file size not to exceed 2 GB, as described under the section called Swath Size and Segmentation above.
- Vertical accuracy of the LiDAR point data will be assessed and reported in accordance with the guidelines developed by the NDEP and subsequently adopted by the ASPRS. The complete guidelines on vertical accuracy are in Section 1.5 of the NDEP Guidelines (NDEP, 2004).
- Vertical accuracy requirements using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology for the point cloud are FVA<= 24.5 cm ACCz, 95-percent confidence level (12.5 cm RMSEz) or, 18.5 cm ACC_z 95-percent confidence level (9.25cm $RMSE_z$) for LiDAR collected at 0.7m NPS

Classified Point Cloud

Delivery of a classified point cloud is a standard requirement for USGS NGP LiDAR projects. Specific scientific research projects may be exempted from this requirement. Classified point cloud deliverables include the following items:

- All project swaths, returns, and collected points, fully calibrated, adjusted to ground, and classified, by tiles. Project swaths exclude calibration swaths, cross-ties, and other swaths not used, or intended to be used, in product generation.
- Fully compliant LAS v1.2 or v1.3, Point Data Record Format 1, 3, 4, or 5.
- LAS v1.3 deliverables with waveform data are to use external auxiliary files with the extension .wdp for the storage of waveform packet data. See the LAS v1.3 Specification for additional information.
- Correct and properly formatted georeference information must be included in all LAS file headers.
- GPS times are to be recorded as Adjusted GPS Time, at a precision sufficient to allow unique timestamps for each pulse.
- Intensity values (native radiometric resolution).
- Tiled delivery, without overlap, using Project Tiling Scheme.
- Classification Scheme (minimum) as listed in table 1.

Bare-Earth Surface (Raster DEM)

Delivery of a bare-earth DEM is a standard requirement for USGS NGP and Nebraska LiDAR projects. Specific scientific research projects may be exempted from this requirement. Bare-earth surface deliverables include the following items:

- Bare-earth DEM, generated to the limits of the Buffered Project Area.
- Cell size no greater than 2 meters or 6 feet, and no less than the design Nominal Pulse Spacing (NPS).
- Delivery in an industry-standard, GIS-compatible, 32-bit floating point raster format (ERDAS .IMG preferred).
- Delivery of a hydro-enforced, bare-earth DEM is a requirement for Nebraska LiDAR projects. Bare-earth surface deliverables include the following items:
- Bare-earth DEM, generated to the limits of the Buffered Project Area.
- Cell size no greater than 2 meters or 6 feet, and no less than the design Nominal Pulse Spacing (NPS).
- Delivery in an industry-standard, GIS-compatible, 32-bit floating point raster format (ERDAS .IMG preferred).

Table 1. Minimum Classified Point Cloud Classification Scheme.

Code Description
1 Processed, but unclassified
2 Bare-earth ground
7a Noise (low or high; manually identified; if needed)
9 Water
10b Ignored Ground (Breakline proximity)
11 Withheld (if the Withheld bit is not implemented in processing software)

a. Class 7, Noise, is included as an adjunct to the Withheld bit. All noise points are to be identified using one of these two methods.
b. Class 10, Ignored Ground, is for points previously classified as bare-earth but whose proximity to a subsequently added breakline requires that it be excluded during Digital Elevation Model (DEM) generation.
    - Georeference information shall be included in each raster file.
    - Tiled delivery, without overlap.

- DEM tiles will show no edge artifacts or mismatch. A quilted appearance in the overall project DEM surface, whether caused by differences in processing quality or character between tiles, swaths, lifts, or other non-natural divisions, will be cause for rejection of the entire deliverable.
- Void areas (for example, areas outside the Buffered Project Area but within the tiling scheme) shall be coded using a unique NODATA value. This value shall be identified in the appropriate location within the raster file header or external support files (for example, .aux).
- Vertical accuracy of the bare-earth surface will be assessed and reported in accordance with the guidelines developed by the NDEP and subsequently adopted by the ASPRS. The complete guidelines are in Section 1.5 of the NDEP Guidelines (NDEP, 2004).
- The following thresholds represent the minimum vertical accuracy requirements using the NDEP/ASPRS methodology:
- For LiDAR collected at 1.4 meter NPS:
    - FVA<= 24.5 cm ACCz, 95 percent Confidence Level (12.5 cm RMSEz)
    - CVA<= 36.3 cm, 95th percentile
    - SVA<= 36.3 cm, 95th percentile
- For LiDAR collected at 0.7 meter NPS:
    - FVA<= 18.5 cm ACCz, 95 percent Confidence Level (9.255 cm RMSEz) for LiDAR collected at 0.7M NPS
    - CVA<= 27.7 cm, 95th percentile
    - SVA<= 27.7 cm, 95th percentile
- All QA/QC analysis materials and results are to be delivered to the USGS.
- Depressions (sinks), natural or man-made, are not to be filled (as in hydro-conditioning and hydro-enforcement).
- Water bodies (ponds and lakes), wide streams and rivers (double-line), and other non-tidal water bodies as defined in the section called Hydro-flattening are to be hydro-flattened within the DEM. Hydro-flattening shall be applied to all water impoundments, natural or man-made, that are larger than 2 acres in area (approximately equal to a round pond 350 feet in diameter), to all streams that are nominally wider than 100 feet, and to all non-tidal boundary waters bordering the project area regardless of size. The methodology used for hydro-flattening is at the discretion of the data producer.

Note: Please refer to the section called Hydro-Flattening and appendix 3 for detailed discussions of hydro-flattening.

Breaklines

Breaklines are not required to meet the Nebraska LiDAR standards. Delivery of the breaklines used in hydro-flattening is a standard requirement for USGS NGP LiDAR projects. If LiDAR is collected as part of a USGS NGP LiDAR project and hydro-flattened with breaklines, breakline deliverables include the following items:

- Breaklines shall be developed to the limit of the Buffered Project Area.
- All breaklines developed for use in hydro-flattening shall be delivered as an ESRI feature class (PolylineZ or PolygonZ format, as appropriate to the type of feature represented and the methodology used by the data producer). Shapefile or geodatabase is required.
- Each feature class or shapefile will include properly formatted and accurate georeference information in the standard location. All shapefiles must include a correct and properly formatted *.prj file.
- Breaklines must use the same coordinate reference system (horizontal and vertical) and units as the LiDAR point delivery.
- Breakline delivery may be as a continuous layer or in tiles, at the discretion of the data producer. In the case of tiled deliveries, all features must edge-match exactly across tile boundaries in both the horizontal (*X*-*Y*) and vertical (*Z*) spatial locations.

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

NITC 3-205: Street Centerline Standards

Notes:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC").
2. If you have comments on this document, you may submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on June 4, 2014.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for June 10, 2014. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.nebraska.gov/technical_panel/meetings/index.html.

NITC 3-205
Street Centerline Standards

review version 3.0
(date 4.18.2014)

Category: Data and Information Architecture
Applicability: See Each Section of Standards
History: Adopted on [Month Day, Year]

NITC | Nebraska Information Technology Commission
GIS Council

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION GIS COUNCIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Standard

1.1 Description

This standard provides requirements necessary for the creation, development, delivery, and maintenance of street centerline data to support a statewide Nebraska Street Centerline Database (NSCD). The database provides spatial location of a seamless road network including information tied to that location with appropriate attribute data. The standard provides a consistent structure for data producers and users to ensure compatibility of datasets within the same framework layer and when used between other Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) framework layers such as address points, parcels and administrative/political boundaries.

There are multiple uses for street centerline data. These requirements will enable the data to be integrated not only with Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) but with existing state road network databases, routing services, emergency management, and public safety. Furthermore, this standard will serve as a guideline for future maintenance activity data requirements.

This standard does not restrict or limit additional information collected and stored in a particular database. The specific requirements for street naming and road conditions are primarily the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. These standards are meant to be a minimum set of standards and are subject to be updated based on technology enhancements, necessary workflow changes, and other data requirements.

The standard is not intended to be a substitute for an implementation design. These standards can be used at local, state and federal level to ensure interdisciplinary compatibility and interoperability with other databases. These standards integrate with existing standards such as the US Federal Highways, National Emergency Number Association (NENA), U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Addressing Standard, and other NITC related standards.

1.2 Spatial Representation

1.2.1 Geometric Placement

The methodology for proper geometric placement of street centerlines will vary based on the application. Street centerlines can be placed either manually or by calculated placement. The calculated placement of the street centerline is completed by automated software techniques, typically in CAD or GIS. Calculations or manual placement methods can be made from the physical footprint referenced from imagery, LiDAR or from mapping grade GPS.

Providing an adequate seamless street centerline database to support public safety and emergency response is the primary focus and will need to support NG9-1-1 standards identified by NENA.

1.2.2 Data Development

All data will consist of visual and verifiable street centerline with address ranges and other information corresponding to some level of ground control. The geometric placement of street centerlines can be derived from digitizing and using field GPS data collection.

1.2.2.1 Digitizing

The data source used to digitize or place street centerlines must meet the following minimum requirements.

Capture Scale for digitizing: 1:2400
Projection: Nebraska State Plane Coordinate System
Datum: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83)
Source: Using aerial imagery that meets verified horizontal accuracy requirements for spatial resolution (12 inch minimum), preferably leaf-off. In cases where tree cover or other obstructions are identified in imagery, it will be necessary to conduct field verification of that location with a mapping grade GPS unit. The NAIP imagery therefore does not meet these accuracy standards.

LiDAR can also be used as a guide to support spatial accuracy placement of certain aspects of roads.

Imagery, LiDAR, or other source document that was used to digitize street centerlines that is newly acquired or not made available for public access will need to be provided to entity conducting quality control of the data.

1.2.2.2 Global Positioning Systems (GPS)

The development of street centerlines can be utilized using field observation and data collection techniques using mapping grade stationary and vehicle equipped GPS. Data collected using a mapping grade GPS will need to meet spatial accuracy requirements in section 1.2.3. Additional post processing of GPS data may be necessary to meet these spatial requirements.

1.2.3 Spatial Accuracy

1.2.3.1 Minimum Horizontal Accuracy Standard

Data that has been collected through digitization or visual representation methods must have an accuracy level of 3.28 to 9.84 feet (1-3 meters) or better.

When using mapping grade GPS, data will need to be collected at 3.28 feet (1 meter) or better. Additional requirements and suggestions for acquiring data by field GPS is located in the NENA GIS Data Collection and Maintenance Standards.

1.2.3.2 Minimum Vertical Accuracy Standard

There are no vertical accuracy requirements at this time.

1.2.4 Feature Type and Tables

1.2.4.1 Lines (Polylines)

A line represents the estimated center of a street or road and is not the legal right of way. Attribute data consists of four address range fields representing low to high on odd and even side of road segments necessary for geocoding. Address range values represent the actual address ranges for the line segment and stored in the feature attribute table of the data set.

1.2.4.2 Centerline Points

These are points used to create and reference particular information on street centerlines useful for assisting topology, addressing, and routing. These include point features considered as nodes to represent intersections, changes in street names, crossings, bridges, and jurisdictional boundary changes. Corresponding attribute information tied to each point is further defined in Section 1.3.6 Data Schema and Descriptions.

1.2.4.3 Tables

Corresponding tables for representing alternative street names can be further represented in tabular format. See Section 1.3.6 Data Schema and Descriptions for description on information for tables.

1.2.5 Projection and Datum

For data to be made available for NG9-1-1 operations, the data will need to be in a geographic coordinate system and not projected. This is necessary for the Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) or the Location Validation Function (LVF) uses for display.

EPSG:	4326 WGS84 / Latlong
Projection:	Geographic Coordinates, Plate Carrée, Equidistant Cylindrical, Equirectangular
Latitude of the origin:	0°
Longitude of the origin:	0°
Scaling factor:	1
False easting:	0°
False northing:	0°
Ellipsoid:	WGS84
Horizontal Datum:	WGS84
Vertical Datum:	WGS84 Geoid
Units:	decimal degrees
Global extent:	-180, -90, 180, 90

The NSCD will also be projected and delivered in Nebraska (State) Plane Coordinate System projection and datum for North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83). The plane coordinate values for a point on the earth's surface should be expressed in feet. The data will also be made available as Web Mercator with WGS 1984 horizontal datum for use among other needed web services.

1.3 Address Attributes

1.3.1 General Address Components

There are several components that make up a street address. Many are required to accurately define a specific address and location. When an address is matched against other address database files or for the purpose of generating an address it must be broken down into the individual components separated by a single space between the components. The minimum components required to accurately define an address are:

Primary Address Number:	123
Prefix Directional Street:	W
Street Name:	Main
Street Type:	ST
Street Direction:	NW

Unit Address Identifiers:	STE
Unit Number:	5
City:	Lincoln
State:	NE
Zip Code:	68509

Not all of the elements are required to be filled out for an address to be valid. However, the placeholders need to be present in the attribute table to accurately represent the accepted USPS standards. The USPS uses a parsing logic to enter address information into their appropriate fields. When parsing an address into the individual components, start from the right element of the address and work toward the left. Place each element in the appropriate field until all address components are isolated. This process facilitates matching files and produces the correct format for standardized output as well as isolating the mismatches to the closest possible fit before failing.

Associated attributes pertain to formatting and storing of address data within attribute tables that are external to and associated with feature attribute tables of geospatial datasets. For example, a city's master address database could be associated with and address matched against a city-wide geospatial dataset of points.

Each jurisdiction shall develop a master address database that can be referenced when new street names are being created or assigned so that duplications are avoided. All street names and address numbers shall be kept consistent with geospatial datasets.

1.3.2 Unique Identification Code

A unique identifier is required for the statewide street centerline database. This unique identifier allows the data to be tied or joined to other spatial data sets having the same identifier. The field name for this unique code in NSCD is "NEStreetID."

1.3.3 Directional Prefixes and Suffixes

The street address directional prefixes and suffixes shall always be abbreviated and capitalized, and shall not include periods. For example, North should be abbreviated as N. A complete set of directional prefix and suffix abbreviations are listed in Appendix 8.1.

1.3.4 Street Name

The USPS and NENA standards will be followed for numbering streets. Street names will use capital and lower case letters. Street names should not be abbreviated unless it is common practice. For example, Doctor (DR) or Junior (JR) could be abbreviated.

Numeric streets shall be written using numbers rather than spelled out. For example, using "1^{ST}" rather than "FIRST". The numeric street names should use "TH", "RD", "ST" or "ND" characters as part of the street name.

Vanity street names and numbers shall not be used as the primary street name or address range component.

For classifying new street names, a standard method of assigning numeric and character street names shall be developed and adopted for a jurisdiction. The primary objective is to establish a grid within each jurisdiction regardless of the detailed pattern of the individual grid. Streets that run primarily east and west would use a numeric street name grid, while those that run primarily north and south would be based on names from a master street name grid, or vice versa. The spacing of numeric street names should be based on a standard increment. A numeric street name should not be used outside of its

proper location and sequence as established by the grid. The spacing of character streets should be based on a similar pattern. A character street name that is part of the grid should not be used outside of its proper location and sequence as established by the grid.

1.3.5 Street Type

Street type is signified by Street (ST), Boulevard (BLVD), Court (CT), and Road (RD) to give you an example. A complete set of street type domains are listed in Appendix 8.1. Each street address will have only one street type based on a logical pattern of street types. The street type names used follow USPS Postal Addressing Standards Publication 28 and other guidelines through NENA. An exception to this rule would be where two streets in the same area have the same name (e.g., Destination Dr and Destination Ct).

1.3.6 Odd/Even Numbering (Address Parity)

Parity shall remain consistent within the system adopted by the local jurisdiction. Address ranges are sets of numbers, usually comprised of four (4) distinct values, representing a range of addresses along the sides of the street centerlines by addresses at either end of a street centerline segment. Two numbers of the range represent the lowest addresses, and the other two represent the highest. The numbers are further distinguished as being on either the left or the right side of the segment. In topological terms, the lower numbers are associates with the FROM node of the segment, while the high numbers are associated with the TO node. Likewise, left and right are determined by the direction of the segment, as defined by the FROM and TO nodes. Topology is critical when a set of addressed centerlines are developed. Implementation of the address parity (e.g., odd versus even) is usually determined by the addressing software.

1.3.7 Sequential Direction

Address ranges shall increase as you travel in the direction adopted by the jurisdiction. The direction of each line segment shall follow the sequence direction of the address ranges. Typically this is accomplished by controlling from-node and to-node topology. One-way streets are NOT an exception to this rule. Curvilinear streets may violate this standard for short stretches provided that they are in compliance with respect to the general direction of the full street segment. Where compliance with this standard is difficult or impossible, it may warrant considering a change in the street name at the point where it changes direction.

1.3.8 Consistency with Distance-Based Address Grid

Depending on the preference of the jurisdiction there must be a defined standard interval based grid system. Whether it is hundred blocks as in a city, a potential 1000 addresses per mile, (a possible address every 5.28 feet), or another variation the jurisdictions accepted standards should be adhered to as close as possible. In rural areas addresses can be assigned based on the distance south or west from the nearest section line. This standard is particularly useful in areas that are largely undeveloped (and thus don't have many cross streets) or in areas that have existing streets that are not in the standard street name grid. This standard should generally be considered to be less important, however, than staying consistent with the address designations of cross streets.

1.3.9 Use of Characters

Street addresses shall not contain characters such as hyphens, dashes, +, #, & or other non-alpha-characters or symbols. An alpha-character added to the address as a sub-number is preferable to a fraction (e.g., 123 A is preferable to 123 1/2).

1.3.10 Data Schema and Descriptions

The following are feature layers necessary for a comprehensive street centerline database. The data schema and descriptions table is provided for each of the features. Each table provides the minimum requirements for each feature type.

Feature	Type	Description
Street Centerlines	Line Layer	Contains street centerline segments
Alternate Street Names	Table/Value	Contains alternate street names
Centerline Points	Point Layer	Point locations used to create road centerlines and assisting with topology, addressing, and routing.

Street Centerlines

The minimum required fields for these standards are represented by the following identifiers: "**R**" – required, "**RC**" –Recommended, and "**O**" – Optional.

Field Name	Field Type	Field Length	Field Description	Domain Name	Required Level
NEStreetID	Number	20	Unique ID of corresponding street centerline segment	N/A	R
PreModifier	String	15	Prefix directional component of segment name	PreModifier	R
PreDirectional	String	2	A street direction that precedes the street name (i.e., N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE, SW)	Direction	R
PreType	String	20	A street type that precedes the street name (i.e., AVE, RD, ST, CIR, PL, PKWY, LN, DR, BLVD, ALY)	StreetType	R
StreetName	String	30	Legal authoritative street name component of segment name	N/A	R
PostType	String	4	A street type that follows the street name (i.e., AVE, RD, ST, CIR, PL, PKWY, LN, DR, BLVD, ALY)	StreetType	R
PostDirectional	String	2	A street direction that follows the street name (i.e., N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE, SW)	Direction	R
PostModifier	String	12	A descriptor that follows the street name and is not a suffix or a direction (i.e., Access, Central, Crossover, Scenic, Terminal, Underpass)	PostModifier	R
LFrom	Number	6	Left low address range	N/A	R
LTo	Number	6	Left high address range	N/A	R

RFrom	Number	6	Right low address range	N/A	R
RTo	Number	6	Right high address range	N/A	R
ParityLeft	String	1	Parity of address range on the left side of the road. E, O, B, Z for even, Odd, Both or Zero.	N/A	R
ParityRight	String	1	Parity of address range on the right side of the road. E, O, B, Z for even, Odd, Both or Zero.	N/A	R
LCityPostal	String	7	5-digit postal code on the left side of the road segment.	N/A	R
RCityPostal	String	7	5-digit postal code on the right side of the road segment.	N/A	R
FIPS_LCity	String	5	City FIPS code of left side of segment	N/A	R
FIPS_RCity	String	5	City FIPS code of right side of segment	N/A	R
FIPS_LCOUNTY	String	3	County FIPS code of left side of segment	CountyFIPS	R
FIPS_RCOUNTY	String	3	County FIPS code of right side of segment	CountyFIPS	R
FIPS_LSTATE	String	2	State FIPS code for left side of segment	StateFIPS	R
FIPS_RSTATE	String	2	State FIPS code for right side of segment	StateFIPS	R
ESNLeft	String	5	Emergency Service Number on left side of road segment	N/A	R
ESNRight	String	5	Emergency Service Number on right side of road segment	N/A	R
MSAGLeft	String	30	MSAG on left side of road segment	N/A	R
MSAGRight	String	30	MSAG on right side of road segment	N/A	R
StreetOwner	String	25	Current local entity responsible for creation of physical street segment	N/A	R
StreetMaint	String	25	Current local entity responsible for maintenance of street segment data	N/A	R
Create_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp when data was first created	N/A	R
Update_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp when data segment geometry/attribution last modified	N/A	R
SourceOfData	String	30	Entity that provided the data	N/A	R

Street_Status_CD	String	1	Status code indicating operational condition of street (1=open, 2=retired, 3=temporarily closed, 4=under construction)	StreetStatus	O
Interstate_Num	Number	2	Interstate Highway number of road segment, if appropriate	N/A	RC
US_Hwy_Num	Number	2	US Highway number of road segment, if appropriate	N/A	RC
State_Hwy_Num	Number	2	State Highway number of road segment, if appropriate	N/A	RC
Local_Rd_Num	Number	2	Local road number of road segment, if appropriate	N/A	RC
Alias1*	String	50	Alias name of road segment	N/A	RC
LZIP	String	10	Area descriptor to aid in geocoding, left side of centerline	N/A	R
RZIP	String	10	Area descriptor to aid in geocoding, right side of centerline	N/A	R
LOCAL_FUNC_CLASS	String	2	Functional Class assigned by road owner with possible suggestions guidelines for possible local classification schema	N/A	RC
STATE_FUNC_CLASS	String	2	Functional Class with classification schema define by standards TWG	N/A	RC
LRS_ID	String	20	ID associated to the road segment found in the NDOR Linear Referencing System	N/A	R
Length	Number	12	Calculated length in US Survey Feet	N/A	R
SpeedLimit	Number	2	The speed limit of the road segment in miles per hour (mph)	N/A	R

*Can have multiple Alias numbers relationship table to infinite number.

Alternate Street Names

Field Name	Field Type	Field Length	Field Description	Domain Name	Required Level
NEStreetID	Number	20	Unique ID of corresponding street centerline segment	N/A	R
PreModifier	Alpha	15	Alternate street prefix type	PreModifier	R
AltStreetName	Alpha	30	Alternate street name. Example: Main, 2nd, Country	N/A	R

			Creek, Third		
PostType	String	4	A street type that follows the street name (i.e., AVE, RD, ST, CIR, PL, PKWY, LN, DR, BLVD, ALY)	StreetType	R
PostDirectional	Alpha	2	Alternate street directional suffice. Example: N, S, E, W, NW, NE, SW, and SE	Direction	R
ASN	Alpha	75	Concatenated Alternate Street Name (STR_PRE+STR_NAME+STR_TYPE+STR_DIR)	N/A	O

Centerline Points

Field Name	Field Type	Field Length	Field Description	Domain Name	Required Level
Unique_ID	Number	9	Framework unique sequential identifier (generated by Framework data steward)	N/A	O
CPType	String	20	Type of point or node (intersection, bridge, railroad crossing, low water crossing, under pass, over pass, change of lane, change of street name in linear path)	N/A	O
X_COORD	Number	15	Points X coordinate	N/A	O
Y_COORD	Number	15	Points Y coordinate	N/A	O
Z_COORD	Number	6	Points Z elevation coordinate in feet	N/A	O
Agree_PT_IND	String	7	Indicator if point is or is not an agreement point.	AgreePoint	O
Create_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp when that point geometry/attribution was first created	N/A	O
Update_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp when geometry/attribution last modified	N/A	O
Status_CD	String	1	Code indicating operational condition of road segment point	N/A	O
Local_ID	Number	9	Local road centerline segment feature identifier, unique and permanent to the segment at the local level (generated by road authority/data custodian)	N/A	O

1.4 Data Format

The data format provided will need to be in an Esri enterprise geodatabase format that can be interpreted by commercial GIS software. A geodatabase schema including domains can be provided by contacting the State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO GIS Shared Services.

Tabular data will need to be provided in MS ACCESS, DBF, or MS SQL formats.

1.5 Quality Control

The quality of the NSCD is evaluated based on the overall functional correctness and completeness of the attribute and spatial data. The Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) has adopted nationally recognized standards for accuracy testing of GIS data.

1.5.1 Attribute Accuracy

a) Attribute fields are complete compared to source data having valid data elements, domain or range values.
b) Correct spelling in comparison of source data.
c) Standard first letter capitalized of every word and USPS capitalization of the State abbreviation.
d) Not to contain duplicate road segments, each road segment should be uniquely identifiable by the attributes.
e) Assure that the address range and information on the left or right of the street centerline are consistently either odd or even addresses.
f) For NG9-1-1 applications, the address ranges need to qualify and meet certain thresholds for the MSAG and ALI databases. For MSAG and ALI databases, the address for each point will need to be valid at a rate of 98 percent or better. For areas without an MSAG, the addresses will meet USPS Publication 28 standards. For the ALI database, this is determined by geocoding the addresses in the ALI database to the road layer with addresses developed for that area. Overall, the address data is consistent with source information from MSAG and ALI.
g) The correct formatting of street centerline attributes are used in these standards and are also included in the NENA standards and abbreviations as they are found in USPS Publication 28.
h) The temporal quality is met by being current through updating appropriate attributes and indicating the time the changes were made in the date updated field. Street centerlines that change due to add-on's from new construction or changes to the existing road structures will need to be updated frequently.
i) Quality checks for allowable domain values, summary statistics and record counts.

1.5.2 Physical Location

The quality of the physical location will be evaluated based on:

a) The placement of the street centerline representing it's real location and if it meets horizontal accuracy requirements. The National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) outlines a methodology for measuring positional accuracy. If additional testing is required, the NSSDA procedures outline the statistical procedures.
b) The geometric placement of the street centerline is consistently logical to the context of other features such as parcels and administrative/political boundaries.

1.5.3 Connectivity Validation (99% acceptance required with 1 foot tolerance)

a) Undershoots - Condition when the end of a linear geometry falls short of intersecting with another linear geometry
b) Overshoots - Condition when the end of a linear geometry extends beyond the point at which it should intersect and stop at another linear geometry
c) Node Mismatch - Condition when the end of a linear geometry falls short of intersecting with the end of another linear geometry
d) Non-coincident Intersecting Geometry - Condition when features intersect one another without creating corresponding vertices at the intersecting points
e) Nearly Coincident Geometry - Condition when a vertex of one geometry falls within the tolerance of a vertex of another geometry

1.5.4 Linear Referencing System (LRS) Validation (99% acceptance required)

a) Missing LRS Keys - Condition when records are missing required LRS keys: NLF_ID, Begin measure and/or End Measure
b) Begin Distance >= End Distance - Condition when begin distance measure greater than or equal to end distance measure
c) Overlapping Distances - Condition when records have the same NLF_ID and that contain overlapping distances between the end measure of one record and the begin measure of another record
d) Linear Measure/Geometry Ratio - Condition when the user-defined linear measure (end distance minus begin distance) compared to the measured map distance for each records exceeds specified tolerance (90-120 percent)
e) Geometry sequence/direction problems - Condition when the digitized direction of geometry is not consistent with direction of increasing measures.
f) Gaps between geometries - Condition when gaps exist between geometry of records with the same NLF_ID exceed specified tolerance (10 ft.).

1.6 Integration with other Standards

1.6.1 Address Standards (NITC 3-206)

The street centerline and address elements identified in these standards shall meet the same address related field names found in the Address Standards NITC 3-206. This is to assure the connection of street addresses and routing to address points having the same address information.

1.7 Metadata

A requirement for street centerline and address range data is creating and maintaining its metadata. The metadata for street centerline data will require detailing the characteristics and quality of submitted street centerline data. Information needs to be provided to allow the user sufficient information so they can determine the data's intended purpose as well as how to access the data. The metadata requires a process description summarizing collection parameters such as: contact information, data source, scale, accuracy, projection, use restrictions, and date associated to each street centerline segment. The process description will also need to be included to describe methodology towards the deliverable products.

1.7.1 Federal Metadata

The Federal Metadata Content Standard from FGDC should be used when feasible and in every effort possible to assure high quality rigorous standards. All geospatial street centerline geodatabases, and their associated attribute databases should be documented with FGDC compliant metadata outlining how the data was derived, attribute field definitions and values, map projections, appropriate map scale, contact information, access and use restrictions, to name a few.

1.7.2 State Metadata

These standards need to apply to Nebraska's metadata standards located within NITC 3-201 Geospatial Metadata Standard. All metadata from street centerline data will need to be registered through the metadata portal at NebraskaMAP (http://NebraskaMAP.gov). All developers of Nebraska-related geospatial data are encouraged to use the site to either upload existing metadata and/or use the online tools available on the site to create the metadata for street centerline data.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this standard is to provide the necessary requirements for the creation, development, delivery, and maintenance of street centerline and address range data to support a statewide NSCD. These standards will help ensure that street centerline and address range data creation and development are current, consistent, accurate, publicly accessible, and cost-effective.

2.2 Objectives

These standards will guide the statewide NSCD having the following objectives:

2.2.1 Provide guidance, street centerline schema, and necessary workflows to state and local officials as they work, either in-house or with private contractors, to create, develop and maintain street centerline and address range data. This can increase the likelihood that the data created will be suitable for the range of intended applications and likely future applications. The maintenance of street centerline and address range data is necessary for the data to be current and accurate. The requirements of maintenance involving stewardship and reporting of errors and handling updates is located in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Street Centerline Address Database Business Plan. These plans are currently in draft and are forthcoming.

2.2.2 Enhance coordination and program management across jurisdictional boundaries by insuring that street centerline and address range data can be horizontally integrated across jurisdictional and/or project boundaries, and other framework data layers for regional or statewide applications.

2.2.3 Save public resources by facilitating the sharing of street centerline and address range data among public agencies or sub-divisions of agencies by incorporating data standards and following guidelines. Data that is developed by one entity can be done in a way that is suitable to serve the multiple needs of other entities. This avoids the costly duplication of developing and maintaining similar street centerline and address range data in the state.

2.2.4 Make street centerline and address range data current and readily accessible to the wide range of potential users through NebraskaMAP and other necessary resources. The statewide street centerline layer will be distributed according to requirements identified in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Street Centerline Address Database Business Plan.

2.2.5 Facilitate harmonious, trans-agency and public policy decision-making and implementation by enabling multiple agencies and levels of government to access and appropriately use current street centerline and address range data. This can make it more likely that intersecting public policy decisions, across levels of government, will be based on the same information.

2.2.6 Lay the foundation for facilitating intergovernmental partnerships for the acquisition and development of high-quality street centerline and address range data by defining standards that increase the likelihood that this data will meet the needs of multiple users.

2.2.7 Establish and promote the integration and interrelationships of street centerline and address range data with related NESDI framework layers through geometric placement and attributes.

3.0 Definitions

Accuracy

Absolute - A measure of the location of features on a map compared to their true position on the face of the earth.

Relative - A measure of the accuracy of individual features on a map when compared to other features on the same map.

Address

Actual or Real - The simple, everyday element that designates a specific, situs location, such as a house number or an office suite.

Range - Numbers associated with segments of a digital street centerline file that represent the actual high and low addresses at either end of each segment.

Theoretical - A location that can be interpolated along a street centerline file through geocoding software.

Vanity - A special address that is inconsistent with or an exception to the standard addressing schema.

Address matching – See Geocoding

Automatic Location Identification (ALI) - The automatic display at the PSAP of the caller's phone number, the address/location of the telephone and supplementary emergency services information of the location from which a call originates.

Attribute - Attributes are the properties and characteristics of entities.

Data Stewardship – Entity(s) responsible for developing and maintaining the data.

Datum – A set of values used to define a specific geodetic system.

Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) - A functional element in an ESInet which is a LoST protocol server where location information (either civic address or geo-coordinates) and a Service URN serve as input to a mapping function that returns a URI used to route an emergency call toward the appropriate PSAP for the caller's location or towards a responder agency.

Entity - A data entity is any object about which an organization chooses to collect data.

Geocoding – A mechanism for building a database relationship between addresses and geospatial features. When an address is matched to the geospatial features, geographic coordinates are assigned to the address.

Line - A linear feature built of straight line segments made up of two or more coordinates.

Location Validation Function (LVF) - A real time database that allows authorized service providers to validate a subscriber's location in real time using a pre-defined interface.

Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) - A listing of streets and house number hich describes the exact spelling of streets, street number ranges, and other address elements.

National Emergency Number Association (NENA) – A professional association consisting of emergency number agencies and telephone company personnel responsible for the planning, implementation, establishing national standards, management, and administration of emergency number systems.

Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) - A framework of geospatial data layers that have multiple applications, used by a vast majority of stakeholders, meet quality standards and have data stewards to maintain and improve the data on an ongoing basis. These layers are also consistent with the Federal National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).

Point - A geospatial feature that is stored as a single X-Y coordinate pair. Some data systems store X-Y-Z coordinates, where Z represents elevation of the point above a given surface (or datum).

Projection – A map projection flattens the earth, allowing for locations to by systematically assigned new positions so that a curved surface can be represented on a flat map

Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) - An entity operating under common management which receives 9-1-1 calls from a defined geographic area and processes those calls according to a specific operational policy.

Road - Generally, this is the physical real-world feature that can be used for vehicular travel. However, this general definition is subject to the road owner's authority to define its accessibility (thus, while navigable by a vehicle, some linear features may be "trails" and thus excluded from the ORCDS). The federal definition used by ODOT for their purposes is appended below.

State Plane Coordinate System - The State Plane Coordinate System is a set of 124 geographic zones or coordinate systems designed for specific regions of the United States. It uses a simple Cartesian coordinate system to specify locations rather than a more complex spherical coordinate system (the geographic coordinate system of latitude and longitude). By thus ignoring the curvature of the Earth, "plane surveying" methods can be used, speeding up and simplifying calculations. The system is highly accurate within each zone (error less than 1:10,000). Outside a specific state plane zone, accuracy rapidly declines, thus the system is not useful for regional or national mapping

Topology – Spatial relationships and connectivity among graphic GIS features, such as points, lines and polygons. These relationships allow display and analysis of "intelligent" data in GIS. Many topological structures incorporate begin and end relationships, direction and right / left identification

Unique Identification Code - Every element is assigned an identification code, making it unique from other elements.

USGS United States Geological Survey - is a scientific agency of the United States government. The scientists of the USGS study the landscape of the United States and its natural resources.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

State agencies that have the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining street centerline and address range data for a particular jurisdiction(s) or geographic area (e.g. for counties for which it has assumed the primary role) are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1. Those state agencies with oversight responsibilities in this area are required to ensure that their oversight guidelines, rules, and regulations are consistent with these standards.

4.2 State Funded Entities

Entities that are not State agencies but receive State funding, directly or indirectly, for street centerline, street naming, and address range development and maintenance for a particular jurisdiction or geographic area are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

4.3 Other

Other entities, such as city and local government agencies (e.g. County Engineer, PSAPs, and municipalities) that receive state funds have the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining street centerline, street naming, and address range data are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

5.0 Responsibility

5.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)

5.2 State Agencies

The State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO (OCIO) GIS Shared Services will be responsible for assuring that metadata is completed and the data is registered and available for distribution through NebraskaMAP.

5.3 Granting Agencies and Entities

State granting or fund disbursement entities or agencies will be responsible for ensuring that these standards are included in requirements related to fund disbursements as they relate to street centerlines and address range data.

5.4 Other

Local government agencies that have the primary responsibility and authority for street naming and street centerline placement will be responsible for ensuring that those sub-sections defined in Section 1 will be incorporated in the overall NSCD data development efforts and contracts.

6.0 Authority

6.1 NITC GIS Council

According to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-572(2), the GIS Council shall: Establish guidelines and policies for statewide Geographic Information Systems operations and management (a) The acquisition, development, maintenance, quality assurance such as standards, access, ownership, cost recovery, and priorities of data bases; (b) The compatibility, acquisition, and communications of hardware and software; (c) The assessment of needs, identification of scope, setting of standards, and determination of an appropriate enforcement mechanism; (d) The fostering of training programs and promoting education and information about the Geographic Information Systems; and (e) The promoting of the Geographic Information Systems development in the State of Nebraska and providing or coordinating additional support to address Geographic Information Systems issues as such issues arise.

6.2 Ownership

Funds and other resources used by the State of Nebraska to create and develop deliverables from the creation of state owned street centerline and address range data makes ownership of said data by the State of Nebraska. This includes the development of all raw data involving spatial and attribute information in databases or files. The sharing of street centerline data will be made available to the public unless otherwise indicated in other terms and license agreements.

7.0 Related Documents

7.1 National Emergency Number Association. “NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model.”NENA-STA-XXX (Currently in Development), http://www.nena.org/?NG911_Project.

7.2 NENA GIS Data Collection and Maintenance Standards, NENA 02-014, Issue 1, July 17, 2007

7.3 NENA Information Document for Synchronizing Geographic Information System databases with MSAG & ALI, NENA 71-501, Version 1.1, September 8, 2009

7.4 NITC 3-201 Geospatial Metadata Standard – http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/3-201.html

7.5 NITC 3-206 Address Standards (Proposed - Update Link When Approved)

7.6 United States Postal Service Publication 28. “Postal Addressing Standards.”

7.7 Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) Governance Plan. (Currently in Development)

7.8 Nebraska Street Centerline Database (NSCD) Business Plan. (Currently in Development)

8.0 Appendices

8.1 Domains

Domains are provided for street centerline, alternate street names, and centerline points. This information provides consistency in reporting of data across multiple data sets.

SuffixAddressNumber

Domain	Description
A	A
B	B
C	C
D	D
E	E
F	F
G	G
H	H
I	I
J	J
K	K
L	L
M	M
N	N
O	O
P	P
Q	Q
R	R
S	S
T	T
U	U
V	V
W	W
X	X
Y	Y
Z	Z

PreModifier

Domain	Description
Alternate	Alternate
Archway	Archway
Behind	Behind
Business	Business
Bypass	Bypass
Center	Center
De	De
Del	Del
Drive	Drive
Entrance	Entrance
Extended	Extended
Head	Head
Historic	Historic
La	La
Le	Le
Loop	Loop
New	New
Old	Old
Olde	Olde
Our	Our
Out	Out
Private	Private
Public	Public
Spur	Spur
The	The
To	To

Direction

Domain	Description
N	North
S	South
E	East
W	West
NE	Northeast
NW	Northwest
SE	Southeast
SW	Southwest

SeperatorElement

Domain	Description
And	And
At	At
By The	By The
Con	Con
De Las	De Las
For	For
For The	For The
In The	In The
Of	Of
Of The	Of The
On The	On The
The	The
To	To
Y	Y

PostModifier

Domain	Description
Access	Access
Alternate	Alternate
Approach	Approach
Business	Business
Bypass	Bypass
Center	Center
Central	Central
Centre	Centre
Company	Company
Concourse	Concourse
Connector	Connector
Crossing	Crossing
Crossover	Crossover
Cut Off	Cut Off
Cutoff	Cutoff
Dock	Dock
End	End
Entrance	Entrance
Executive	Executive
Exit	Exit
Extended	Extended
Extension	Extension
Industrial	Industrial
Interior	Interior
Loop	Loop
Overpass	Overpass
Private	Private
Public	Public
Ramp	Ramp
Scenic	Scenic
Service	Service
Spur	Spur
Terminal	Terminal
Transverse	Transverse
Underpass	Underpass

State

Domain	Description
NE	Nebraska
CO	Colorado
WY	Wyoming
SD	South Dakota
IA	Iowa
MO	Missouri
KS	Kansas

StateFIPS

Domain	Description
31	Nebraska
08	Colorado
56	Wyoming
46	South Dakota
19	Iowa
28	Missouri
20	Kansas

StreetSource

Domain	Description
PSC	Public Service Commission street centerlines
CountySC	County street centerlines
MunicipalSC	Municipal street centerlines
StateSC	State street centerlines
Other	Other

StreetStatus

Domain	Description
1	Open
2	Retired
3	Temporarily closed
4	Under Construction

StreetType (for both PreType and PostType) Additional commonly used street suffixes and abbreviations are located within the USPS Publication 28.

Domain	Description
Acrs	Acres
Aly	Alley
Anx	Annex
Arc	Arcade
Ave	Avenue
Bay	Bay
Bch	Beach
Bg	Burg
Bgs	Burgs
Blf	Bluff
Blfs	Bluffs
Blvd	Boulevard
Bnd	Bend
Br	Branch
Brg	Bridge
Brk	Brook
Brks	Brooks
Btm	Bottom
Byp	Bypass
Byu	Bayou
Chas	Chase
Cir	Circle
Cirs	Circles
Clb	Club
Clf	Cliff
Clfs	Cliffs
Clos	Close
Cmn	Common
Cmns	Commons
Cnrs	Corners
Cor	Corner
Cors	Corners
County Hwy	County Road
County Rte	County Touring Route
Cp	Camp
Cpe	Cape

StreetType, continued	
Cres	Crescent
Crk	Creek
Crse	Course
Crst	Crest
Cswy	Causeway
Ct	Court
Ctr	Center
Ctrs	Centers
Cts	Courts
Curv	Curve
Cv	Cove
Cvs	Coves
Cyn	Canyon
Dl	Dale
Dm	Dam
Dr	Drive
Drs	Drives
Drwy	Driveway
Dv	Divide
End	End
Est	Estate
Ests	Estates
Expy	Expressway
Ext	Extension
Exts	Extensions
Fall	Fall
Farm	Farm
Fld	Field
Flds	Fields
Fls	Falls
Flt	Flat
Flts	Flats
Frd	Ford
Frds	Fords
Frg	Forge
Frgs	Forges
Frk	Fork
Frks	Forks
Frst	Forest
Fry	Ferry
Ft	Fort
Fwy	Freeway
Gate	Gate
Gdn	Garden
Gdns	Gardens
Gln	Glen
Glns	Glens
Grds	Grounds
Grn	Green
Grns	Greens
Grv	Grove
Grvs	Groves
Gtwy	Gateway
Hbr	Harbor
Hbrs	Harbors
Hl	Hill
Hls	Hills
Holw	Hollow
Hrbr	Harbor
Hts	Heights
Hvn	Haven
Hwy	Highway
I	Interstate
Inlt	Inlet
Is	Island
Isle	Isle
Iss	Islands
Jct	Junction
Jcts	Junctions
Knl	Knoll
Knls	Knolls
Ky	Key
Kys	Keys
Land	Land
Lck	Lock
Lcks	Locks
Ldg	Lodge
Lf	Loaf
Lgt	Light
Lgts	Lights
Lk	Lake
Lks	Lakes
Ln	Lane
Lndg	Landing
Loop	Loop
Mall	Mall
Mdw	Meadow
Mdws	Meadows
Mews	Mews
Ml	Mill
Mls	Mills
Mnr	Manor
Mnrs	Manors
Msn	Mission
Mt	Mount
Mtn	Mountain
Mtns	Mountains
Mtwy	Motorway
Nck	Neck
Opas	Overpass
Orch	Orchard
Otlk	Outlook
Oval	Oval
Ovlk	Overlook
Park	Park
Pass	Pass
Path	Path
Pike	Pike
Pkwy	Parkway
Pl	Place
Pln	Plain
Plns	Plains
Plz	Plaza
Pne	Pine
Pnes	Pines
Pr	Prairie
Prom	Promenade
Prt	Port
Prts	Ports
Psge	Passage
Pt	Point
Pts	Points

StreetType, continued

Radl	Radial
Ramp	Ramp
Rd	Road
Rdg	Ridge
Rdgs	Ridges
Rds	Roads
Rdwy	Roadway
Rise	Rise
Riv	River
Rnch	Ranch
Row	Row
Rpd	Rapid
Rpds	Rapids
Rst	Rest
Rte	Route
Rue	Rue
Run	Run
Shls	Shoals
Sho	Shoal
Shr	Shore
Shrs	Shores
Skwy	Skyway
Smt	Summit
Spg	Spring
Spgs	Springs
Spur	Spur
Sq	Square
Sqs	Squares
St	Street
Sta	Station
State Hwy	State Touring Highway
State Pkwy	State Parkway
State Rte	State Route
Stra	Stravenue
Strm	Stream
Sts	Streets
Ter	Terrace
Tlpk	Trailer Park
Tpke	Turnpike
Trak	Track
Trce	Trace
Trfy	Trafficway
TrkTrl	Truck Trail
Trl	Trail
Trlr	Trailer
Trwy	Thruway
Tunl	Tunnel
Turn	Turn
Twrs	Towers
Un	Union
Uns	Unions
Upass	Underpass
US Hwy	Federal Highway
US Rte	US Route
Vale	Vale
Via	Viaduct
Vis	Vista
Vl	Ville
Vlg	Village
Vlgs	Villages
Vls	Villas
Vly	Valley
Vlys	Valleys
Vw	View
Vws	Views
Walk	Walk
Wall	Wall
Way	Way
Ways	Ways
Wds	Woods
Wels	Wells
Wl	Well
Wood	Wood
Xing	Crossing
Xrd	Crossroad
Xrds	Crossroads

UnitType

Domain	Description
APT	Apartment
BSMT	Basement
	Blank, unable to determine
BLDG	Building
DEPT	Department
FL	Floor
FRNT	Front
HNGR	Hanger
KEY	Key
LBBY	Lobby
LOT	Lot
LOWR	Lower
OFC	Office
PH	Penthouse
PIER	Pier
REAR	Rear
RM	Room
SIDE	Side
SLIP	Slip
SPC	Space
STOP	Stop
STE	Suite
TRLR	Trailer
UNIT	Unit
UPPR	Upper

AgreePoint

Domain	Description
Y	Yes
N	No

CountyFIPS

Domain	Description
1	Adams
3	Antelope
5	Arthur
7	Banner
9	Blaine
11	Boone
13	Box Butte
15	Boyd
17	Brown
19	Buffalo
21	Burt
23	Butler
25	Cass
27	Cedar
29	Chase
31	Cherry
33	Cheyenne
35	Clay
37	Colfax
39	Cuming
41	Custer
43	Dakota
45	Dawes
47	Dawson
49	Deuel
51	Dixon
53	Dodge
55	Douglas
57	Dundy
59	Fillmore
61	Franklin
63	Frontier
65	Furnas
67	Gage
69	Garden
71	Garfield
73	Gosper
75	Grant
77	Greeley
79	Hall
81	Hamilton
83	Harlan
85	Hayes
87	Hitchcock
89	Holt
91	Hooker
93	Howard
95	Jefferson
97	Johnson
99	Kearney
101	Keith
103	Keya Paha
105	Kimball
107	Knox
109	Lancaster
111	Lincoln
113	Logan
115	Loup
117	McPherson
119	Madison
121	Merrick
123	Morrill
125	Nance
127	Nemaha
129	Nuckolls
131	Otoe
133	Pawnee
135	Perkins
137	Phelps
139	Pierce
141	Platte
143	Polk
145	Red Willow
147	Richardson
149	Rock
151	Saline
153	Sarpy
155	Saunders
157	Scotts Bluff
159	Seward
161	Sheridan
163	Sherman
165	Sioux
167	Stanton
169	Thayer
171	Thomas
173	Thurston
175	Valley
177	Washington
179	Wayne
181	Webster
183	Wheeler
185	York

Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Standards and Guidelines

Draft Document
30-Day Comment Period

NITC 3-206: Address Standards

Notes:

1. The following document is a draft document under review by the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission ("NITC").
2. If you have comments on this document, you may submit them by email to rick.becker@nebraska.gov, or call 402-471-7984 for more information on submitting comments.
3. The comment period for this document ends on June 4, 2014.
4. The Technical Panel will consider this document and any comments received at a public meeting following the comment period, currently scheduled for June 10, 2014. Information about this meeting will be posted on the NITC website at http://nitc.nebraska.gov/technical_panel/meetings/index.html.

NITC 3-206
Address Standards

review version 3.0
(date 4.18.2014)

Category: Data and Information Architecture
Applicability: See Each Section of Standards
History: Adopted on [Month Day, Year]

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION GIS COUNCIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Standard

1.1 Description

This standard provides requirements necessary for the creation, development, delivery, and maintenance of address point data to support a statewide Nebraska Address Database (NAD). The address database provides the spatial location and information tied to that location with appropriate attribute data. The standard provides a consistent structure for data producers and users to ensure compatibility of datasets within the same framework layer and when used between other Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) framework layers such as street centerlines and parcels.

There are multiple uses for address point data. These requirements will enable the data to be integrated not only with Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) but with existing state address databases, routing services, emergency management, public safety, tax assessment, and the state's enterprise geocoding application databases. Furthermore, this standard will serve as a guideline for future maintenance activity data requirements.

This standard does not restrict or limit additional information collected and stored in a particular database. The specific requirements for address naming and point placement are primarily the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. These standards are meant to be a minimum set of standards and are subject to be updated based on technology enhancements, necessary workflow changes, and other data requirements.

The standard is not intended to be a substitute for an implementation design. These standards can be used at local, state and federal level to ensure interdisciplinary compatibility and interoperability with other databases. These standards integrate with existing standards such as the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Addressing Standard, and other NITC related standards.

1.2 Spatial Representation

1.2.1 Geometric Placement

The methodology for proper geometric placement of address points will vary based on the application. Address points can be placed either manually or by calculated placement. The calculated placement is completed by automated software techniques, typically in GIS. Calculations or manual placement methods can be made from the structure's visual footprint seen in imagery, LiDAR or a determined boundary. Site or structures that have an address assigned to it would be considered an address point.

Providing adequate address point locations to support public safety and emergency response is the primary focus and will need to support NG9-1-1 standards identified by NENA. At a minimum, one address point placed per address is suggested by these standards. For NG9-1-1 applications, there will be one address point provided for dispatching as to not create conflict in interpretation among other address point locations tied to the same street address when responding to emergencies. For other applications, additional address points can be created as long as they are notated in the attribute table for purpose of the point type. The following suggestions are recommended in priority of address point placement. If a primary structure is not addressable on the property parcel then a property access point is placed within the property driveway or access location. In cases where the primary structure is not visible from the addressable road, an additional access point will need to be placed in the middle of the entrance or access location within that property parcel. Additional address points are required for public safety at entrance locations for public structures such as schools, hospitals, and government offices.

Specific requirements for the placement of entrance locations are located within NENA standards source located in section 7.0.

There are additional standards and best practices for the placement of address points within structures outlined by NENA. This includes single address with multiple structures or entrances, single structure or entrances with multiple addresses, multiple addresses with one structure or entrance. In addition, there are address point placement recommendations for exterior and interior entrance locations within a structure.

1.2.1.1 Primary Structure

The primary address point should be placed within every principal address structure's location or footprint. Placement can be achieved either manually or calculated. When placed manually, the point should reflect the center or entrance to the addressed structure as long as it is within the structure's footprint (Figure 1). When calculated, it typically refers to placement of a centroid in the middle of the building footprint or polygon. Either of these two placement techniques assign the address with that structure.

Figure 1. Placement of address point within structure's footprint.

If a structure is not visible on aerial imagery or LiDAR, but it's physical location is represented by other supplemental resources, the point can be placed according to the supplement resources and needs to be confirmed with field verification.

For multiple units within a structure, there does not need to be additional address points placed for each unit. The single point can relate to a table having multiple listings of addresses for each unit. Consider using this method when addresses are relatively within 10 feet of each other.

1.2.1.2 Property Access

This is the placement of the address point to accessing the property of interest. This typically is a driveway, access road, or other entrance path to a property that is connected to a named road or other path from a different

property. Address points should be located at the primary driveway entrance within a parcel boundary. This point is placed only after the primary structure address point has been identified and placed or if there is no primary addressable structure on the property parcel. If parcel data exists to the property, then the point should fall within the parcel boundary in the middle of the driveway or other access area.

Figure 2. Placement of address point on primary entrance path within a parcel boundary as shown on the left address point for 7909. The illustration also shows the placement of the address point on the primary structure footprint. This is helpful in cases where the primary building is difficult to see from the primary entrance path off an addressed road.

Interim placement of address points can exist if a site or structure is not available at the time of recording. This can include conditions where site or building is under construction or new developments that may have future sub-addresses. The expectation is that these interim locations are noted during time of creation and future modifications can occur to both the geometric placement and attributes.

1.2.1.3 Other Placement Options

After the primary and/or secondary address points have been placed or in special cases where the primary and secondary conditions are not able to be met, then there are other address point placement options. Specific requirements for these placement options are located within NENA standards source located in section 7.0. The following are a few descriptions for other placement options.

a) Parcels

This section addresses the placement of the address point within a parcel boundary when there are no addressed structures or visible access road to the property. The address point can either be placed in the center of the parcel, within a parcel where an internal road or main structures are located, within a parcel at the center of the parcel frontage next to the road that

references the address, and within and front of a parcel using address ranges to guide placement. Parcels that do not have an addressable structure present will have the address point at the centroid within the boundary of the parcel. If there is discrepancy in the placement accuracy of the parcel itself, it is best to have the point located in the middle of the parcel until or at an offset distance from the boundary line from the road that references the address. This will assure that the address point is well within the parcel boundary in case the spatial location of parcel boundary is updated in the future. It also assures that other spatial relationships exist with other GIS layers.

b) Site

A site is defined as a place that has no known or recognized structure or boundary. These can include places such as parks, camp sites, recreational areas, and other large areas. In this case, either an address point is placed based on the centroid of a defined boundary or is associated as a landmark. Point location can also be manually located at the entrance or area of concentration of structures or activities within the site.

c) Geocoding from Road Centerlines

Address point placement is achieved by interpolation of road centerline address ranges. Points are placed based on a calculated method of directional offset representing left or right of the street and providing a desired distance to the property based on address range breaks located in the street centerline layer. This practice should be considered last resort as it provides inconsistency with distances to the actual structure or access location to a property. This technique is useful when establishing and double checking the correct attributes between the street centerline database corresponding to the address point database.

1.2.2 Data Development

All data will consist of visual and verifiable address point information corresponding to some level of ground control. The geometric placement of address points can be derived from digitizing and using field GPS data collection.

1.2.2.1 Digitizing

Address point placement can be completed by visual registration using aerial imagery, site plans or other graphical resources that have been spatially adjusted to meet minimum spatial accuracy requirements. The data source used to digitize or place address points must meet the following minimum requirements.

Capture Scale for digitizing: 1:2400
Projection: Nebraska State Plane Coordinate System
Datum: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83)
Source: Using aerial imagery that meets verified horizontal accuracy requirements for spatial resolution (12 inch minimum), preferably leaf-off. In cases where tree cover or other obstructions are identified in imagery, it will be necessary to conduct field verification of that location with a mapping grade GPS unit. The NAIP imagery therefore does not meet these accuracy standards.

LiDAR can also be used as a guide to support spatial accuracy placement of certain aspects of building footprints.

Imagery, LiDAR, or other source document that was used to digitize street centerlines that is newly acquired or not made available for public access will need to be provided to entity conducting quality control of the data.

1.2.2.2 Global Positioning Systems (GPS)

The development of address points can be utilized using field observation and data collection techniques using mapping grade GPS. Data collected using a mapping grade GPS will need to meet spatial accuracy requirements in section 1.2.3. Additional post processing of GPS data may be necessary to meet these spatial requirements, particularly when placement of address point falls within the boundary of a structure.

1.2.3 Spatial Accuracy

1.2.3.1 Minimum Horizontal Accuracy Standard

Data that has been collected through digitization or visual representation methods must have an accuracy level of 3.28 to 9.84 feet (1-3 meters) or better.

When using mapping grade GPS, data will need to be collected at 3.28 feet (1 meter) or better. Additional requirements and suggestions for acquiring address point data by field GPS is located in the NENA GIS Data Collection and Maintenance Standards.

1.2.3.2 Minimum Vertical Accuracy Standard

There are no vertical accuracy requirements at this time. These standards are subject to change in the future as data maintenance and accuracy of address point placement is further needed in places such as structures having multiple floors.

1.2.4 Feature Type and Tables

1.2.4.1 Points

Single points will represent the address point features. Corresponding attribute information tied to each point is further defined in Section 1.3.6 Data Schema and Descriptions. Having one point per valid address ensures a one to one match for the purposes of geocoding.

1.2.4.2 Tables

Corresponding tables for one address point location but reference to multiple locations or sub-addresses can be further represented in tabular format. See Section 1.3.6 Data Schema and Descriptions for description on information for tables.

1.2.5 Projection and Datum

For data to be made available for NG9-1-1 operations, the data will need to be in a geographic coordinate system and not projected. This is necessary for the Emergency Call Routing Function (ECRF) or the Location Validation Function (LVF) uses for display.

EPSG:	4326 WGS84 / Latlong
Projection:	Geographic Coordinates, Plate Carrée, Equidistant Cylindrical, Equirectangular
Latitude of the origin:	0°
Longitude of the origin:	0°
Scaling factor:	1
False easting:	0°
False northing:	0°
Ellipsoid:	WGS84
Horizontal Datum:	WGS84
Vertical Datum:	WGS84 Geoid
Units:	decimal degrees
Global extent:	-180, -90, 180, 90

The NAD will also be projected and delivered in Nebraska (State) Plane Coordinate System projection and datum for North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83). The plane coordinate values for a point on the earth's surface should be expressed in feet. The data will also be made available as Web Mercator with WGS 1984 horizontal datum for use among other needed web services.

1.3 Address Attributes

1.3.1 General Address Components

There are several components that make up an address. Many are required to accurately define a specific address and location. When an address is matched against other address database files or for the purpose of generating an address it must be broken down into the individual components separated by a single space between the components. The minimum components required to accurately define an address are:

Primary Address Number:	123
Prefix Directional Street:	W
Street Name:	Main
Street Type:	ST
Street Direction:	NW
Unit Address Identifiers:	STE
Unit Number:	5
City:	Lincoln
State:	NE
Zip Code:	68509

Not all of the elements are required to be filled out for an address to be valid. However, the placeholders need to be present in the attribute table to accurately represent the accepted USPS standards. The USPS uses a parsing logic to enter address information into their appropriate fields. When parsing an address into the individual components, start from the right element of the address and work toward the left. Place each element in the appropriate field until all address components are isolated. This process facilitates matching files and produces the correct format for standardized output as well as isolating the mismatches to the closest possible fit before failing.

Associated attributes pertain to formatting and storing of address data within attribute tables that are external to and associated with feature attribute tables of geospatial datasets. For example, a city's master address database could be associated with and address matched against a city-wide geospatial dataset of points.

Each jurisdiction shall develop a master address database that can be referenced when new street names are being created or assigned so that duplications are avoided. All street names and address numbers shall be kept consistent with geospatial datasets.

Additional information and guidelines for directional prefixes and suffixes, street naming, street type, address parity, sequential direction and consistency with distance-based address grid can be found in the Street Centerline Standards (NITC 3-205).

1.3.2 Unique Identification Code

A unique identifier is required for the statewide address point database. This unique identifier allows the data to be tied or joined to other spatial data sets having the same identifier. The field name for this unique code in NAD is "NEAddressID." The first four (4) digits are the county name followed by number associated from the local addressing authority.

1.3.3 Use of Characters

Street addresses shall not contain characters such as hyphens, dashes, +, #, & or other non-alpha-characters or symbols. An alpha-character added to the address as a sub-number is preferable to a fraction (e.g., 123 A is preferable to 123 1/2).

1.3.4 Data Schema and Descriptions

The following table represents the necessary data schema including field names, descriptions, and associated domains for the address point database. The minimum required fields for these standards are represented by the following identifiers: "**R**" – required, "**RC**" –Recommended, and "**O**" – Optional.

Field Name	Field Type	Field Length	Field Description	Domain Name	Required Level
NEAddressID	String	12	Unique ID of address point where first 4 characters are the first 4 letters of each County name. The remaining 8 characters of the number are provided by the local addressing authority.	N/A	R
NEStreetID	Integer	20	Unique ID of corresponding street centerline segment	N/A	R
State_PID	String	30	County FIPS code plus local government PID number (See Statewide Parcel Database ID requirements)	N/A	R
County_ID	String	3	County FIPS code of where address point resides	CountyFIPS	R
PrefixAddressNumber	String	10	An extension that precedes the address number	N/A	R
AddressNumber	Integer	6	The numeric identifier of a location along a thoroughfare (i.e., 100, 2345, 31)	N/A	R
SuffixAddressNumber	String	15	An extension that follows the address number (i.e., A through Z)	SuffixAddressNumber	R
PreModifier	String	15	A street name modifier that precedes the street name. (i.e., Alternate, bypass, loop,	PreModifier	R

			private, spur, etc.)		
PreDirectional	String	2	A street direction that precedes the street name (i.e., N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE, SW)	Direction	R
PreType	String	4	A street type that precedes the street name (i.e., AVE, RD, ST, CIR, PL, PKWY, LN, DR, BLVD, ALY)	StreetType	R
SeparatorElement	String	10	An element that precedes the StreetName which separates the PreType and StreetName	SeparatorElement	R
StreetName	String	30	Legal authoritative street name component of segment name	N/A	R
PostType	String	4	A street type that follows the street name (i.e., AVE, RD, ST, CIR, PL, PKWY, LN, DR, BLVD, ALY)	StreetType	R
PostDirectional	String	2	A street direction that follows the street name (i.e., N, S, E, W, NE, NW, SE, SW)	Direction	R
PostModifier	String	12	A descriptor that follows the street name and is not a suffix or a direction (i.e., Access, Central, Crossover, Scenic, Terminal, Underpass)	PostModifier	R
Building	String	60	The name of one among a group of buildings that have the same address number and street name, that are multiple independently named structures at the same address	N/A	R
Floor	String	10	A floor, story, or level within a building	N/A	O
NumberFloors	String	4	Number of floors in building	N/A	O
Room	String	10	A room identification in a building	N/A	RC
NumberRooms	String	4	Number of rooms in building or structure.	N/A	O
Seat	String	5	The place where a person may be located within a room or building.	N/A	O
Unit	String	4	A group or suite of rooms within a building that are under common ownership or tenancy, typically having a common primary entrance. (ie, A, 4, etc.)	N/A	R
UnitType	String	4	The unit type abbreviation. (ie, APT, BLDG, DEPT, FL, STE, UNIT	UnitType	C
Location	String	20	For sub-address, other than building, floor, unit, room or seat. For example, northeast corner of building.	N/A	O

Subdivision	String	60	Subdivision name	N/A	C
City	String	40	Name of the municipality where the site is located. Also the postal community name associated to the zip code or postal code.	N/A	R
State	String	2	State name abbreviation	State	R
ZipCode	String	5	5 digit zip code	N/A	R
Ph_Zip4	String	4	Mailing post code +4 designation for the tax parcel	N/A	RC
FullAddress	String	75	Concatenated street address consisting of address number, pre direction, pre type, street name, street type, suffix direction, unit number, building, floor.	N/A	RC
SubAddress	String	75	Entire sub-address string that consists of Building, Floor, Unit, and Location fields concatenated together	N/A	RC
LandmarkName	String	60	Common Place Name such as library, town hall, Chimney Rock, stadium	N/A	R
MSAG	String	30	Service community name associated with the location of the address.	N/A	R
ESN	String	5	Emergency Service Number associated with the location of the address identified by MSAG.	N/A	R
PSAP	String	25	Public Service Access Point identifier number	N/A	R
PrimaryPoint	String	3	Is this the primary point? Yes or No. Distinguishes between Primary and SubAddress points.	PrimaryPoint	R
PointType	String	3	Address point type (primary structure, primary property entrance, secondary structure, secondary property entrance, parcel centroid, etc.)	PointType	R
PlaceType	String	75	Description of the type of feature for address (House, duplex, trailer, apartment, secondary structure, utility, school, hospital, commercial business, industrial, etc.)	N/A	RC
AddOwner	String	25	Current local entity responsible for creation of address data	N/A	R
AddMaint	String	25	Current local entity responsible for maintenance of address data	N/A	R
AddressSource	String	30	The primary data source for the attributes used in this record	AddressSource	R

SourceOfData	String	30	Entity that provided the data	N/A	R
Create_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp data was collected	N/A	R
Update_DT	Date	26	Date/time stamp the record was last modified	N/A	R
RecentFieldEditor	String	30	Recent field editor of data	N/A	R
Add_Status__Code	String	2	Status code indicating operational condition of address point (1=active, 2=retired, 3=unknown)	N/A	R
Basement	String	3	Is there a basement? Yes, No	N/A	O
StrmShelter	String	25	The type of storm shelter	N/A	O
OccupTime	String	50	Time when the site/structure is typically occupied (7:00 – 6:00 pm)	N/A	O
X_COORD	Numeric	15	Points X coordinate	N/A	R
Y_COORD	Numeric	15	Points Y coordinate	N/A	R
Z_COORD	Numeric	7	Points Z elevation coordinate in feet. Height above mean sea level.	N/A	O
Comments	String	100	Comments or notes	N/A	O

1.4 Data Format

The data format provided will need to be in an enterprise geodatabase format that can be interpreted by commercial GIS software. A geodatabase schema including domains can be provided free upon request by contacting the State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO GIS Shared Services.

Tabular data will need to be provided in MS ACCESS, DBF, or MS SQL formats.

1.5 Quality Control

The quality of the NAD is evaluated based on the overall functional correctness and completeness of the attribute and spatial data. The Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) has adopted nationally recognized standards for accuracy testing of GIS data.

1.5.1 Attribute Accuracy

a) Attribute fields are complete compared to source data having valid data elements, domain or range values.
b) Correct spelling in comparison of source data.
c) Standard first letter capitalized of every word and USPS capitalization of the State abbreviation.
d) Not to contain duplicate address points, each address point should be uniquely identifiable by the attributes.
e) Assure that the address points on the left or right of the street centerline are consistently either odd or even addresses.

f) The address point database has a thematic approach to accuracy. In other words, the type of address points recorded reflect the appropriate attribute values associated to that type. The data schema is setup with several field names that help qualify these relationships and thematic criteria to ensure accuracy of address point information.
g) For NG9-1-1 applications, the address for each point need to qualify and meet certain thresholds for the MSAG and ALI databases. For MSAG and ALI databases, the address for each point will need to be valid at a rate of 98 percent or better. For areas without an MSAG, the addresses in the point file will meet USPS Publication 28 standards. For the ALI database, this is determined by geocoding the addresses in the ALI database to the point layer with addresses developed for that area. Overall, the address data is consistent with source information from MSAG and ALI.
h) The correct formatting of address attributes are used in these standards and are also included in the NENA standards and abbreviations as they are found in USPS Publication 28.
i) The temporal quality is met by being current, updating appropriate attributes, and indicating the time the changes were made in the date updated field. Address points assigned early on due to missing or unknown structures may end up being incorrect later on as construction begins and structures are further identified.
j) Internal QA/QC checks for allowable domain values, summary statistics and record counts.

1.5.2 Physical Location

The quality of the physical location will be evaluated based on:
a) The placement of the address point representing it's real location and if it meets horizontal accuracy requirements. The National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) outlines a methodology for measuring positional accuracy. If additional testing is required, the NSSDA procedures outline the statistical procedures.
b) The geometric placement of the address point is consistently logical to the context of other features such as street centerlines, parcels, emergency service zones, and other address points.

1.6 Integration with other Standards

1.6.1 Street Centerline Standards (NITC 3-205)

The address elements identified in these standards shall meet the same address field relationships found in the Street Centerline Standards NITC 3-205. This is to assure the connection of street addresses and routing to address points having the same address information.

1.7 Metadata

A requirement for address point data is creating and maintaining it's metadata. The metadata for address point data will require detailing the characteristics and quality of submitted address points. Information needs to be provided to allow the user sufficient information so they can determine the data's intended purpose as well as how to access the data. The metadata requires a process description summarizing collection parameters such as: contact information, data source, scale, accuracy, projection, use restrictions, and date associated to each street centerline segment. The process description will also need to be included to describe methodology towards the deliverable products.

1.7.1 Federal Metadata

The Federal Metadata Content Standard from FGDC should be used when feasible and

in every effort possible to assure high quality rigorous standards. All geospatial address point geodatabases, and their associated attribute databases should be documented with FGDC compliant metadata outlining how the data was derived, attribute field definitions and values, map projections, appropriate map scale, contact information, access and use restrictions, to name a few.

1.7.2 State Metadata

These standards need to apply to Nebraska's metadata standards located within NITC 3-201 Geospatial Metadata Standard. All metadata from address point data will need to be registered through the metadata portal at NebraskaMAP (http://NebraskaMAP.gov). All developers of Nebraska-related geospatial data are encouraged to use the site to either upload existing metadata and/or use the online tools available on the site to create the metadata for address point data.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this standard is to provide the necessary requirements for the creation, development, delivery, and maintenance of address point data to support a statewide NAD. These standards will help ensure that address data creation and development are current, consistent, accurate, publicly accessible, and cost-effective.

2.2 Objectives

These standards will guide the statewide NAD having the following objectives:

2.2.1 Provide guidance, address database schema, and necessary workflows to state and local officials as they work, either in-house or with private contractors, to create, develop and maintain address point data. This can increase the likelihood that the data created will be suitable for the range of intended applications and likely future applications. The maintenance of address data is necessary for the data to be current and accurate. The requirements of maintenance involving stewardship and reporting of errors and handling updates is located in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Nebraska Address Database Business Plan. These plans are currently in draft and are forthcoming.

2.2.2 Enhance coordination and program management across jurisdictional boundaries by insuring that address point data can be horizontally integrated across jurisdictional and/or project boundaries, and other framework data layers for regional or statewide applications.

2.2.3 Save public resources by facilitating the sharing of address point data among public agencies or sub-divisions of agencies by incorporating data standards and following guidelines. Data that is developed by one entity can be done in a way that is suitable to serve the multiple needs of other entities. This avoids the costly duplication of developing and maintaining similar address point data in the state.

2.2.4 Make address point data current and readily accessible to the wide range of potential users through NebraskaMAP and other necessary resources. The statewide address database layer will be distributed according to requirements identified in the NESDI Governance Plan and current Nebraska Address Database Business Plan.

2.2.5 Facilitate harmonious, trans-agency and public policy decision-making and implementation by enabling multiple agencies and levels of government to access and appropriately use current address data. This can make it more likely that intersecting

public policy decisions, across levels of government, will be based on the same information.

2.2.6 Lay the foundation for facilitating intergovernmental partnerships for the acquisition and development of high-quality address point data by defining standards that increase the likelihood that this data will meet the needs of multiple users.

2.2.7 Establish and promote the integration and interrelationships of address data with related NESDI framework layers through geometric placement and attributes.

3.0 Definitions

Accuracy

Absolute - A measure of the location of features on a map compared to their true position on the face of the earth.

Relative - A measure of the accuracy of individual features on a map when compared to other features on the same map.

Address

Actual or Real - The simple, everyday element that designates a specific, situs location, such as a house number or an office suite.

Range - Numbers associated with segments of a digital street centerline file that represent the actual high and low addresses at either end of each segment.

Theoretical - A location that can be interpolated along a street centerline file through geocoding software.

Vanity - A special address that is inconsistent with or an exception to the standard addressing schema.

Address matching – See Geocoding

Automatic Location Identification (ALI) - The automatic display at the PSAP of the caller's phone number, the address/location of the telephone and supplementary emergency services information of the location from which a call originates.

Attribute – The properties and characteristics of entities.

Datum – A set of values used to define a specific geodetic system.

Data Stewardship – Entity(s) responsible for developing and maintaining the data.

Entity – a data entity is any object about which an organization chooses to collect data.

Geocoding – A mechanism for building a database relationship between addresses and geospatial features. When an address is matched to the geospatial features, geographic coordinates are assigned to the address.

Geospatial feature – A point, line or polygon stored within geospatial software.

Line – A linear feature built of straight line segments made up of two or more coordinates.

Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) - A listing of streets and house number hich describes the exact spelling of streets, street number ranges, and other address elements.

National Emergency Number Association (NENA) – A professional association consisting of emergency number agencies and telephone company personnel responsible for the planning, implementation, establishing national standards, management, and administration of emergency number systems.

Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) - A framework of geospatial data layers that have multiple applications, used by a vast majority of stakeholders, meet quality standards and have data stewards to maintain and improve the data on an ongoing basis. These layers are also consistent with the Federal National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).

Point - A geospatial feature that is stored as a single X-Y coordinate pair. Some data systems store X-Y-Z coordinates, where Z represents elevation of the point above a given surface (or datum).

Projection – A map projection flattens the earth, allowing for locations to by systematically assigned new positions so that a curved surface can be represented on a flat map

Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) - An entity operating under common management which receives 9-1-1 calls from a defined geographic area and processes those calls according to a specific operational policy.

State Plane Coordinate System - The State Plane Coordinate System is a set of 124 geographic zones or coordinate systems designed for specific regions of the United States. It uses a simple Cartesian coordinate system to specify locations rather than a more complex spherical coordinate system (the geographic coordinate system of latitude and longitude). By thus ignoring the curvature of the Earth, "plane surveying" methods can be used, speeding up and simplifying calculations. The system is highly accurate within each zone (error less than 1:10,000). Outside a specific state plane zone, accuracy rapidly declines, thus the system is not useful for regional or national mapping

Unique Identification Code – Every element is assigned an identification code, making it unique from other elements. For these standards, the first four (4) digits are the county name followed by number associated from the local addressing authority.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

State agencies that have the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining address point data for a particular jurisdiction(s) or geographic area (e.g. for counties for which it has assumed the primary role) are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1. Those state agencies with oversight responsibilities in this area are required to ensure that their oversight guidelines, rules, and regulations are consistent with these standards.

4.2 State Funded Entities

Entities that are not State agencies but receive State funding, directly or indirectly, for address point development and maintenance for a particular jurisdiction or geographic area are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

4.3 Other

Other entities, such as city and local government agencies (e.g. County Engineer, PSAPs, and municipalities) that receive state funds have the primary responsibility for developing and maintaining address point data are required to comply with the standards as described in Section 1.

5.0 Responsibility

5.1 NITC

The NITC shall be responsible for adopting minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)

5.2 State Agencies

The State of Nebraska, Office of the CIO (OCIO) GIS Shared Services will be responsible for ensuring that standards and guidelines relative to development, meeting quality control standards, and approving address points for the statewide address point database for distribution are conducted according to subsections in Section 1. The OCIO GIS Shared Services will be responsible for assuring that metadata is completed and the data is registered and available for distribution through NebraskaMAP.

5.3 Granting Agencies and Entities

State granting or fund disbursement entities or agencies will be responsible for ensuring that these standards are included in requirements related to fund disbursements as they relate to address points.

5.4 Other

Local government agencies that have the primary responsibility and authority for address naming and point placement will be responsible for ensuring that those sub-sections defined in Section 1 will be incorporated in the address point data development efforts and contracts.

6.0 Authority

6.1 NITC GIS Council

According to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-572(2), the GIS Council shall: Establish guidelines and policies for statewide Geographic Information Systems operations and management (a) The acquisition, development, maintenance, quality assurance such as standards, access, ownership, cost recovery, and priorities of data bases; (b) The compatibility, acquisition, and communications of hardware and software; (c) The assessment of needs, identification of scope, setting of standards, and determination of an appropriate enforcement mechanism; (d) The fostering of training programs and promoting education and information about the Geographic Information Systems; and (e) The promoting of the Geographic Information Systems development in the State of Nebraska and providing or coordinating additional support to address Geographic Information Systems issues as such issues arise.

6.2 Ownership

Funds and other resources used by the State of Nebraska to create and develop deliverables from the creation of state owned street centerline and address range data makes ownership of said data by the State of Nebraska. This includes the development of all raw data involving

spatial and attribute information in databases or files. The sharing of street centerline data will be made available to the public unless otherwise indicated in other terms and license agreements.

7.0 Related Documents

7.1 National Emergency Number Association. “NENA Information Document for Development of Site/Structure Address Point GIS Data for 9-1-1.”NENA-STA-XXX (Currently in Development), http://www.nena.org/?NG911_Project.

7.2 National Emergency Number Association. “NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model.”NENA-STA-XXX (Currently in Development), http://www.nena.org/?NG911_Project.

7.3 NENA GIS Data Collection and Maintenance Standards, NENA 02-014, Issue 1, July 17, 2007

7.4 NENA Information Document for Synchronizing Geographic Information System databases with MSAG & ALI, NENA 71-501, Version 1.1, September 8, 2009

7.5 NITC 3-201 Geospatial Metadata Standard – http://nitc.ne.gov/standards/3-201.html

7.6 NITC 3-205 Street Centerline Standards (Proposed - Update Link When Approved).

7.7 United States Postal Service Publication 28. “Postal Addressing Standards.”

7.8 Nebraska Spatial Data Infrastructure (NESDI) Governance Plan. (Currently in Development).

7.9 Nebraska Address Database (NAD) Business Plan. (Currently in Development)

8.0 Appendices

8.1 Domains

Domains are provided for street centerline, alternate street names, and centerline points. This information provides consistency in reporting of data across multiple data sets.

SuffixAddressNumber

Domain	Description
A	A
B	B
C	C
D	D
E	E
F	F
G	G
H	H
I	I
J	J
K	K
L	L
M	M
N	N
O	O
P	P
Q	Q
R	R
S	S
T	T
U	U
V	V
W	W
X	X
Y	Y
Z	Z

PreModifier

Domain	Description
Alternate	Alternate
Archway	Archway
Behind	Behind
Business	Business
Bypass	Bypass
Center	Center
De	De
Del	Del
Drive	Drive
Entrance	Entrance
Extended	Extended
Head	Head
Historic	Historic
La	La
Le	Le
Loop	Loop
New	New
Old	Old
Olde	Olde
Our	Our
Out	Out
Private	Private
Public	Public
Spur	Spur
The	The
To	To

Direction

Domain	Description
N	North
S	South
E	East
W	West
NE	Northeast
NW	Northwest
SE	Southeast
SW	Southwest

SeperatorElement

Domain	Description
And	And
At	At
By The	By The
Con	Con
De Las	De Las
For	For
For The	For The
In The	In The
Of	Of
Of The	Of The
On The	On The
The	The
To	To
Y	Y

PostModifier

Domain	Description
Access	Access
Alternate	Alternate
Approach	Approach
Business	Business
Bypass	Bypass
Center	Center
Central	Central
Centre	Centre
Company	Company
Concourse	Concourse
Connector	Connector
Crossing	Crossing
Crossover	Crossover
Cut Off	Cut Off
Cutoff	Cutoff
Dock	Dock
End	End
Entrance	Entrance
Executive	Executive
Exit	Exit
Extended	Extended
Extension	Extension
Industrial	Industrial
Interior	Interior
Loop	Loop
Overpass	Overpass
Private	Private
Public	Public
Ramp	Ramp
Scenic	Scenic
Service	Service
Spur	Spur
Terminal	Terminal
Transverse	Transverse
Underpass	Underpass

State

Domain	Description
NE	Nebraska
CO	Colorado
WY	Wyoming
SD	South Dakota
IA	Iowa
MO	Missouri
KS	Kansas

PointType

Domain	Description
1	Primary Structure
2	Primary Property Entrance
3	Secondary Structure
4	Secondary Property Entrance
5	Parcel Centroid
6	Other location in Parcel
7	Site
8	Geocoded from Street Centerlines
9	Other

AddressSource

Domain	Description
County911AL	County 911 Address List
CountyAP	County Address Points
CountyBF	County Building Footprint
CountyCP	County Common Places
CountyParcels	County Parcels
GDRAP	GDR Address Points
MunicipalAP	Municipal Address Points
MunicipalParcels	Municipal Parcels
StateAP	State Address Points
Other	Other

PrimaryPoint

Domain	Description
Y	Yes
N	No

StreetType (for both PreType and PostType) Additional commonly used street suffixes and abbreviations are located within the USPS Publication 28.

Domain	Description
Acrs	Acres
Aly	Alley
Anx	Annex
Arc	Arcade
Ave	Avenue
Bay	Bay
Bch	Beach
Bg	Burg
Bgs	Burgs
Blf	Bluff
Blfs	Bluffs
Blvd	Boulevard
Bnd	Bend
Br	Branch
Brg	Bridge
Brk	Brook
Brks	Brooks
Btm	Bottom
Byp	Bypass
Byu	Bayou
Chas	Chase
Cir	Circle
Cirs	Circles
Clb	Club
Clf	Cliff
Clfs	Cliffs
Clos	Close
Cmn	Common
Cmns	Commons
Cnrs	Corners
Cor	Corner
Cors	Corners

StreetType, continued

County Hwy	County Road
County Rte	County Touring Route
Cp	Camp
Cpe	Cape
Cres	Crescent
Crk	Creek
Crse	Course
Crst	Crest
Cswy	Causeway
Ct	Court
Ctr	Center
Ctrs	Centers
Cts	Courts
Curv	Curve
Cv	Cove
Cvs	Coves
Cyn	Canyon
Dl	Dale
Dm	Dam
Dr	Drive
Drs	Drives
Drwy	Driveway
Dv	Divide
End	End
Est	Estate
Ests	Estates
Expy	Expressway
Ext	Extension
Exts	Extensions
Fall	Fall
Farm	Farm
Fld	Field
Flds	Fields
Fls	Falls
Flt	Flat
Flts	Flats
Frd	Ford
Frds	Fords
Frg	Forge
Frgs	Forges
Frk	Fork
Frks	Forks
Frst	Forest
Fry	Ferry
Ft	Fort
Fwy	Freeway
Gate	Gate
Gdn	Garden
Gdns	Gardens
Gln	Glen
Glns	Glens
Grds	Grounds
Grn	Green
Grns	Greens
Grv	Grove
Grvs	Groves
Gtwy	Gateway
Hbr	Harbor
Hbrs	Harbors
Hl	Hill
Hls	Hills
Holw	Hollow
Hrbr	Harbor
Hts	Heights
Hvn	Haven
Hwy	Highway
I	Interstate
Inlt	Inlet
Is	Island
Isle	Isle
Iss	Islands
Jct	Junction
Jcts	Junctions
Knl	Knoll
Knls	Knolls
Ky	Key
Kys	Keys
Land	Land
Lck	Lock
Lcks	Locks
Ldg	Lodge
Lf	Loaf
Lgt	Light
Lgts	Lights
Lk	Lake
Lks	Lakes
Ln	Lane
Lndg	Landing
Loop	Loop
Mall	Mall
Mdw	Meadow
Mdws	Meadows
Mews	Mews
Ml	Mill
Mls	Mills
Mnr	Manor
Mnrs	Manors
Msn	Mission
Mt	Mount
Mtn	Mountain
Mtns	Mountains
Mtwy	Motorway
Nck	Neck
Opas	Overpass
Orch	Orchard
Otlk	Outlook
Oval	Oval
Ovlk	Overlook
Park	Park
Pass	Pass
Path	Path
Pike	Pike
Pkwy	Parkway
Pl	Place
Pln	Plain
Plns	Plains
Plz	Plaza
Pne	Pine
Pnes	Pines
Pr	Prairie
Prom	Promenade
Prt	Port

StreetType, continued

Prts	Ports
Psge	Passage
Pt	Point
Pts	Points
Radl	Radial
Ramp	Ramp
Rd	Road
Rdg	Ridge
Rdgs	Ridges
Rds	Roads
Rdwy	Roadway
Rise	Rise
Riv	River
Rnch	Ranch
Row	Row
Rpd	Rapid
Rpds	Rapids
Rst	Rest
Rte	Route
Rue	Rue
Run	Run
Shls	Shoals
Sho	Shoal
Shr	Shore
Shrs	Shores
Skwy	Skyway
Smt	Summit
Spg	Spring
Spgs	Springs
Spur	Spur
Sq	Square
Sqs	Squares
St	Street
Sta	Station
State Hwy	State Touring Highway
State Pkwy	State Parkway
State Rte	State Route
Stra	Stravenue
Strm	Stream
Sts	Streets
Ter	Terrace
Tlpk	Trailer Park
Tpke	Turnpike
Trak	Track
Trce	Trace
Trfy	Trafficway
TrkTrl	Truck Trail
Trl	Trail
Trlr	Trailer
Trwy	Thruway
Tunl	Tunnel
Turn	Turn
Twrs	Towers
Un	Union
Uns	Unions
Upass	Underpass
US Hwy	Federal Highway
US Rte	US Route
Vale	Vale
Via	Viaduct
Vis	Vista
Vl	Ville
Vlg	Village
Vlgs	Villages
Vls	Villas
Vly	Valley
Vlys	Valleys
Vw	View
Vws	Views
Walk	Walk
Wall	Wall
Way	Way
Ways	Ways
Wds	Woods
Wels	Wells
Wl	Well
Wood	Wood
Xing	Crossing
Xrd	Crossroad
Xrds	Crossroads

UnitType

Domain	Description
APT	Apartment
BSMT	Basement
	Blank, unable to determine
BLDG	Building
DEPT	Department
FL	Floor
FRNT	Front
HNGR	Hanger
KEY	Key
LBBY	Lobby
LOT	Lot
LOWR	Lower
OFC	Office
PH	Penthouse
PIER	Pier
REAR	Rear
RM	Room
SIDE	Side
SLIP	Slip
SPC	Space
STOP	Stop
STE	Suite
TRLR	Trailer
UNIT	Unit
UPPR	Upper

CountyFIPS

Domain	Description
1	Adams
3	Antelope
5	Arthur
7	Banner
9	Blaine
11	Boone
13	Box Butte
15	Boyd
17	Brown
19	Buffalo
21	Burt
23	Butler
25	Cass
27	Cedar
29	Chase
31	Cherry
33	Cheyenne
35	Clay
37	Colfax
39	Cuming
41	Custer
43	Dakota
45	Dawes
47	Dawson
49	Deuel
51	Dixon
53	Dodge
55	Douglas
57	Dundy
59	Fillmore
61	Franklin
63	Frontier
65	Furnas
67	Gage
69	Garden
71	Garfield
73	Gosper
75	Grant
77	Greeley
79	Hall
81	Hamilton
83	Harlan
85	Hayes
87	Hitchcock
89	Holt
91	Hooker
93	Howard
95	Jefferson
97	Johnson
99	Kearney
101	Keith
103	Keya Paha
105	Kimball
107	Knox
109	Lancaster
111	Lincoln
113	Logan
115	Loup
117	McPherson
119	Madison
121	Merrick
123	Morrill
125	Nance
127	Nemaha
129	Nuckolls
131	Otoe
133	Pawnee
135	Perkins
137	Phelps
139	Pierce
141	Platte
143	Polk
145	Red Willow
147	Richardson
149	Rock
151	Saline
153	Sarpy
155	Saunders
157	Scotts Bluff
159	Seward
161	Sheridan
163	Sherman
165	Sioux
167	Stanton
169	Thayer
171	Thomas
173	Thurston
175	Valley
177	Washington
179	Wayne
181	Webster
183	Wheeler
185	York

State of Nebraska
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Standards and Guidelines

AMENDMENTS TO NITC 1-204

(Pursuant to § 1.4.2 of the standard, the Technical Panel may approve these amendments.)

NITC 1-204 (IT Procurement Review Policy) is amended as follows:

1. Attachment A is amended to read:

List of Preapproved Items for Purchase

For the purpose of procurement reviews conducted pursuant to NEB. REV. STAT. §§ 81-1117, 81-1120.17 and 81-1120.20, the following items are preapproved for purchase by agencies, if the cost of the item is less than $500.00:

1. Functionally equivalent parts needed to repair existing equipment
2. Cables for connecting computer components
3. Power cords / adapters
4. Extender cables for keyboards / mice
5. KVM (Keyboard - Video - Mouse) switches
6. USB / PS2 connectors
7. Memory chips
8. Laptop batteries
9. Laptop docking stations
10. UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) units, and replacement batteries
11. Keyboards, including those for tablet computers
12. Mice
13. Microphones
14. Speakers
15. Monitors that are ordered without a system
16. Hard drives
17. CD/DVD/Blu-ray drives and players
18. Video cards
19. Network cards
20. Barcode pens and readers
21. Card readers
22. Smart board overlays
23. Projectors and projector lamps
24. Desktop printers, scanners, and multifunction devices (combining some or all of the following: printer, copier, scanner, and fax machine)
25. Printer toner and ink
~~26. Desktop scanners~~
~~27.~~26. Small label printers
~~28.~~27. Blank CDs, DVDs ~~or~~, Blu-ray discs, or tapes
~~29. Blank tapes~~
~~30.~~28. Digital voice recorders
~~31.~~29. Flash drives
~~32.~~30. Software books
~~33.~~31. Training CDs, DVDs or Blu-ray discs
~~34.~~32. Logic boards and computers that are integral parts of equipment that serves a primary purpose other than information management, including digital cameras, lab equipment, and motor vehicles. (Items covered here are not subject to the $500.00 limit.)
~~35.~~33. The Office of CIO may provide documented preapproval for the purchase of certain other items by an agency.