

Meeting Agenda
NAACCR GIS Committee
Wednesday, December 12, 2007
2:00-3:00 PM Eastern Time
1:00-2:00 PM Central Time
12:00-1:00 PM Mountain Time
11:00-12:00 Pacific Time
10:00-11:00 Alaskan Time

Toll free number: 1-866-784-0143

Passcode: 9425222

A. Roll Call

Members Present: Frank Boscoe – Chair, Kevin Henry –Vice Chair, Dan Goldberg, Christian Klaus, Holly Hodges, Pam Agovino, Stephanie Foster, Jim Files, Robin Crocker (CDC), Carolyn Halbert, Dave Stinchcomb, Chris Johnson, Vijay Raghavan, Recinda Sherman, Daniel Shorter (guest), Sachin Agnihotri (guest)

NAACCR Staff Present: Joshua Whitley

Members Absent: David O'Brien, Jennifer Kachajian, Cathy Riddell, Yongping Hao, Bob Borchers, Meg Watson, Jim Martin, Mary Mroszczyk, Chris Newton, Myles Cockburn, Susan Brown, Heidi Gianella, Ken Hill

B. Minutes

1. Approval of October minutes
 - a. No comments or corrections. A motion to approve was made by Jim Files. It was 2nded by Christian Klaus. The motion passed unanimously.
2. November minutes not yet available (as of 12/11/07)
 - a. These will be sent out this afternoon.

C. Old Business

1. Geocoding Best-Practices Document – Dan or Frank
 - a. They are still in the same situation: still editing. The group fell a week behind, but things are still going smoothly. Frank had to tell NAACCR that they would not be done by the end of CY '07.
2. Sponsorship of student to NAACCR conference- Carolyn
 - a. Contacted 3 vendors. Heard back from only 1 and they said funds were tied up. Contacting ACS was no good. Carolyn asked for more vendors. She will follow back with positive responses.

3. Rules for address consolidation – Frank (for Bob)
 - a. Frank was not sure how many responses Bob got. He copied everyone on what he was coming up with. Frank found that we do have a system in place for choosing the address at diagnosis using “type of reporting source” and “class of case” variables. Frank evaluated this system to see how well it was working. He found that only a very small fraction of cases remain ambiguous. Bob was concerned that there could still be a possibility of choosing an address that was not geocodable. He preferred to have system where you can see if address is geocodable before looking at other criteria. Frank estimated that this would impact about 17 cases/year. In Frank’s registry, geocoding is done as the last step. He wondered if this was the case in other registries. NJ – cases already consolidated before Geocoding. Florida is the same way. Chris – Ohio: consolidation is done first. Christian – registry has had 2 vendors – their experiences varied. Geocoding was done prior to consolidation for 1 vendor, post-consolidation for the other. Bob will continue consolidation work based on gathered information.

4. Geocoding NPI – Chris or Kevin
 - a. The committee has been tasked with providing a geocoded NPI data file each year. There were several questions to be answered: Who will geocode the data? Where might we have server space? What format(s) should the database be available in? If an individual state wants to change/update their geocoded records, what is the process? Some members thought it was a great idea to try to include feedback. In terms of server space, on the first trial, the Geocoding results dbf file is ~2 GB. This is expected to grow to 3-4 times that size within 2 years. It was suggested that we supply the file in several formats including: SAS, SQL Server, Access, GIS, etc... Access is out because of the max DB size. Dan said that USC is already supposed to have this data in their GIS lab. He also noted that they have TB of storage that could possibly be used for this process. Kevin said his registry can run this through for the first pass. Last time, this took about 2 hours. He said the process of getting the file geocoded should be documented. Frank mentioned that we did not commit to a 100% geocoded file. NAACCR was touted as the most obvious choice for hosting the file. It probably won’t be available until January 20th or so. Either Dan or Josh should have approval by then.

D. New Business

Census Tract 2000 – (who did this?)

Still getting data with 0’s coded (indicating the census tract has not been geocoded). There has been some resistance in trying to put in an edit. This field still allows 0 as valid value. Someone mentioned that perhaps 0’s should be used for non-US addresses. The question was, why would someone want to geocode a non-US address in the census tract data? (Speaker) proposed cleaning this up to remove any 0000’s. (Speaker) will put together a proposal for change. This issue was endorsed by the GIS committee via lack of objection.

Modify Coordinate Quality - Christian

This was just changed in October. Christian said that, in light of the previous changes being so recent, we should discuss this now and wait to submit it to UDS. There is a small subset of records (which Christian believes probably occurs everywhere) where address components conflict with each other. There seems to be no intelligent way to determine the correct area. Basically, it is either guess or don't geocode. Christian wants to assign new code for the reason why it wasn't geocoded (see document Proposed_Change_Dec_07.doc). Frank – David and Brian weren't on the call. Frank would like to hear from them regarding this. Frank needs to be convinced why this distinction needs to be made between code 97 (proposed) and 99. Why do we need more detail? 99 – Unable to assign coordinates based on available information. 97 is more specific to the geocoder making a choice to not geocode the case based on research that showed too many issues with the case. This was essentially tabled until the next meeting.

E. Meeting Adjourned